DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 057 UD 005 156

By-Lohman, Maurice A.

The Expansion of the After School Study Centers for Disadvantaged Public and Nonpublic School Pupils.

Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y. Committee on Field Research and Evaluation.

Spons Agency-New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Pub Date Sep 67

Note-122p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$6.20

Descriptors-Admission Criteria, *After School Centers, *After School Education, *After School Programs, After School Tutoring, Art, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Elementary Schools, Enrichment Activities, Evaluation Methods, Health Education, Library Facilities, Music, Program Evaluation, Remedial Arithmetic, Remedial Reading, Staff Utilization

Identifiers-Elementary Secondary Education Act Title 1 Program, ESEA Title 1 Program, New York City

Evaluated is an extended school day program initiated with Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I, funds. To alleviate learning difficulties faced by disadvantaged children in the classroom, this after school program provided additional teacher time, attention, and instruction. The program offered tutorial services in reading and arithmetic as well as use of the library under the guidance of library teachers and teachers to help with homework. Special enrichment activities in art, music, and health education were also provided. Centers were set up in 120 public elementary schools and five nonpublic schools, and were open three days a week for two-hour sessions. Pupil attendance, which was voluntary, was one of the most crucial problems in the centers. The evaluation notes such other problems as the need for supervisors to handle all supervision and clerical details, conflicts over space, lack of provision for staff conferences, and lack of communication with the day school. An extensive appendix describes the evaluation design and the noted instruments. For a history and description of ESEA, Title I, in New York City, 1965-1968, see UD 007 904. (NH)

ED029057

OE/BESE
TITLE I
05156 E

EVALUATION OF NEW YORK CITY TITLE I
EDUCATIONAL PROJECTS 1966-67

THE EXPANSION OF THE AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS FOR DISADVANTAGED PUBLIC AND NONPUBLIC SCHOOL PUPILS

By Maurice A. Lohman

September 1967

UD 005 156

The Center For Urban Education
33 West 42nd St., New York, N.Y. 10036

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE EXPANSION OF THE AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS FOR DISADVANTAGED PUBLIC AND NONPUBLIC SCHOOL PUPILS

Maurice A. Lohman

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1966-67 school year.

Committee on Field Research and Evaluation
Joseph Krevisky, Assistant Director

September 1967

UD 005 156

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		page
I	Introduction	1
II	Purpose and Objectives of Study	8
III	Methods and Procedure of the Study	9
IV	Findings	12
V	Conclusion	56
	Appendix A: Evaluation Design	A1
	Appendix B: Instruments	B1
	Appendix C: Staff List	C1

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to thank Mr. Theodore Langbaum, Coordinator of the After School Study Centers whose door was always open and who often took time away from a busy schedule to arrange visits and appointments for the observation teams.

Thanks are also due, Miss Sheila MacMahon, Mrs. Shirley Hockman, Mr. Arthur F. Donovan, Mr. John M. O'Shea, Miss Helen Spector, and Mrs. Harriet Brown, who coordinated the programs in the project and whose willing cooperation and help was indispensable to the survey.

The evaluation would not have been possible without the cooperation of the ASSC Supervisors and teachers who tolerated the teams of curious investigators constantly getting in their way and asking questions.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Large numbers of disadvantaged children residing in New York City are in need of special assistance with their regular school work. The After School Study Center Program was conceived by the New York City Board of Education to help alleviate the learning difficulties these children might meet in their classrooms. By extending the school day, this program provided additional teacher time, attention and instruction to help these children improve their study habits and increase their self-confidence and motivation.

In May and June of 1966 the Board of Education inaugurated a pilot program which (1) provided tutorial services in reading and arithmetic, (2) made possible the use of the library under the guidance of library teachers, (3) provided teachers to help with homework, and (4) offered special enrichment activities in the areas of art, music, and health education. The program was funded by the United States Office of Education under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. An expansion of the After School Study Centers for disadvantaged public and nonpublic school pupils was funded under Title I for the 1966-67 school year, based upon the experiences gained in the pilot program.

The Nature of the Program

After School Study Centers were set up in 120 public elementary schools and five nonpublic schools. The centers were open three days per week from 3:15 to 5:15 PM, or in some cases from 3:00 to 5:00 PM. All centers were staffed by regularly licensed teachers and supervisors of the NYC Board of

Education. In October 1966, classes were set up to provide remedial reading instruction and remedial mathematics instruction. Space was provided for doing homework assignments and for using the school library, under the guidance of a teacher.

A program of "Special Potential Development Services" was also conducted as a part of the After School Study Centers (ASSC). Specialist teachers, where available, provided varied activities in the areas of art, music, health education; these included group projects, development of new areas of instruction, the use of audiovisual materials and the identification of talented and gifted children. To support the Special Potential Development Services, materials and equipment suitable for art, music, and health education were placed in the centers.

For all classes, the school received an extra supply of instructional materials suitable for remedial and enrichment activities. There were kits of general supplies and special reading and mathematics materials.

The ASSC program was made available on a voluntary basis to any student who was in need of help.

Organization of Classes and Activities

Remedial classes in reading and in mathematics were organized for approximately 10 to 15 pupils. All other groups had approximately 25 pupils. Where a center had more pupils than could be accommodated, waiting lists were maintained and pupils were admitted as openings occurred. Classes included both public and nonpublic school pupils. Criteria for assigning pupils to classes included age-grade levels and pupil maturity, need, ability, and interest.

All but five centers were established in public school buildings and children from neighboring nonpublic schools attended the public school centers. The five nonpublic school study centers were located in areas where transportation to a public school was not practical. Any pupil who normally received transportation to his home school, received transportation to the center.

Staff

Supervision

The supervisor of each center was usually an assistant principal from the center day school staff. Where an assistant principal was not available, an acting assistant principal, a junior principal, or in some cases, a principal served as supervisor. Table 1 summarizes the distribution of the center supervisors by licensed position. In 14 per cent of the centers it was necessary to divide the supervision between two assistant principals who served on different days.

The supervisors were responsible for:

1. Adapting the objectives of the program to the needs and interests of the pupils.
2. Motivating pupil attendance with the aid of teachers, nonpublic school personnel and parents.
3. Recruiting teachers for the program.
4. Training teachers, with the help and cooperation of project coordinators and field supervisors.
5. Supervising the health and safety of the pupils.
6. Organizing classes and activities, coordinating programs and schedules, and integrating the center activities with the day school program.

Table 1

Classifications of Supervisors by Position

Position	N	%
Assistant Principal	106	78
Principal	16	12
Junior Principal	6	4
Acting Assistant Principal	3	2
Teacher-in-charge	3	2
Common Branch Teacher	2	2
Total	136	100%

Teaching Staff

The teachers were appointed from lists recommended by the day school supervisors. All teachers were regularly licensed teachers or permanent substitutes. In some cases it was necessary to hire per diem substitutes. These per diem teachers were usually regular teachers on maternity leave serving under substitute licenses.

Where possible, teachers were chosen from the day school staff of the school where the center was located. Table 2 shows the number of teachers appointed to the program (which is the same as the number of classes) and the average class site for each program.

Table 2

Number of Teachers, Average Class Size, and Pupil Sessions by Program

Program	Number of Teachers (a)	Average Class Size	Pupil Sessions (b)
Tutorial Services			
Reading	562	11	597,304
Arithmetic	173	12	201,592
Homework	94	17	147,001
Library	122	18	185,571
Special Potential Development Services			
Music	212	30	596,352
Health	205	14	278,881
Art	202	35	376,250
Total	1570		2,382,951

a. The number of teachers is identical with the number of classes.

b. Pupil Sessions is a compilation of the pupil registers for the entire 35 weeks of the program.

Secretarial Staff

Each center was assigned a secretary for two of the three two-hour sessions per week. The secretary's duties included the preparation of pupil and teacher attendance records and reports, service reports, typing, and duplication of curriculum materials, correspondence, and answering the telephone.

Pupils

Pupil Selection

The pupil quotas for each school were set up on the basis of the total register of the school. The program started out by allowing space for 8 per cent of school registers. As applications were received, however, adjustments were made. This was especially true where some nonpublic schools did not send pupils to fill the quota for neighboring centers.

In the public schools, the pupils selected for the tutorial reading or arithmetic classes were a year or more below their grade level as measured by citywide standard tests. Pupils who were receiving special instruction in reading clinics or from corrective reading or arithmetic teachers in their home schools were not admitted to the program.

The selection of pupils for the special potential classes in art, music, and health education was based upon the expressed interest of the pupil.

In the nonpublic schools, the school principal was responsible for the selection of pupils. Registration procedures and coordination of the programs were determined at meetings between the principal of the center school and the principal of the nonpublic school. The ASSC supervisor registered pupils and assigned them to classes. The nonpublic school principal was informed of the program assigned to each of his pupils.

Although attendance was voluntary, pupil absences were recorded. Teachers were required to record daily attendance and to submit weekly attendance reports to the Board of Education by feeder school. Table 2 presents the number of pupil sessions reported.

Project Area

Schools included in the project were in attendance areas with high concentrations of low income families. Each school enrolled many disadvantaged children who required special educational services. Approximately 30,000 children participated in the project, at least part time, during the 35 weeks between October 1966 and May 1967.

Objectives of the Program

The project description listed the following objectives:

"1. To increase proficiency in reading and arithmetic by providing remedial tutorial programs.

2. To increase general achievement and motivation for school work by providing supervised help with homework assignments.

3. To teach proper use of the library.

4. To enrich educational experiences for disadvantaged pupils through the use of duly licensed specialist teachers of music, art, health education, and library.

5. To aid those children for whom English is a second language."

Each curriculum area set up a number of its own related objectives. These will be discussed in the chapters describing each curriculum area of the ASSC program.

CHAPTER II

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF STUDY

The purpose of the study was to evaluate the project in terms of the stated objectives of the project design. Although the objectives for the various curriculum areas differed somewhat, the total evaluation was concerned with the following questions:

1. Were the reading, arithmetic, music, art, health education, and library programs for disadvantaged children in the public and nonpublic schools strengthened as a result of the project?
2. Did the project improve the pupils' attitudes toward school?
3. Were talents discovered and developed?
4. Were the reading, arithmetic, music, art, health education, and library programs conducted in an educationally sound manner as determined by knowledgeable persons from the various curriculum areas? These experts were directed to evaluate, for each area, the physical facilities, materials and supplies, professional practices and methods, course objectives, and course content.
5. How many children took advantage of the program?
6. What were the opinions of pupils, teachers, supervisors, and administrators as to the effect of the program?

In addition to the evaluation of the stated objectives of the project, the study attempted to offer recommendations for the improvement of future similar programs.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY

Evaluation Teams

Evaluation teams, consisting of qualified personnel from university education faculties of public and nonpublic schools, were recruited by the Center for Urban Education. The tutorial reading and arithmetic, music, and art teams consisted of two members each; the health education team consisted of three members. Each team member had a wide range of experience in his curriculum area and was a college professor, instructor, or an advanced candidate for the doctoral degree in his curriculum area, with extensive teaching experience in the public or nonpublic schools.

Evaluation Instruments

The evaluation teams developed a general research prospectus (see Appendix A) for all curriculum areas of the project. Each team then constructed instruments to collect and measure the specific information required for a particular curriculum area.

The following evaluation instruments were developed for use by the curriculum evaluation teams:

(1) Tutorial Reading and Arithmetic

  (a) Tutorial Program Worksheet, guide which requested information about the registration of the class, the physical surroundings, records, teaching, supervisory practices, articulation with nonpublic schools, and suggestions of the observer (Appendix B).

(b) General Information Questionnaire, a questionnaire sent to each teacher requesting additional information about the program, facilities, equipment, pupils, and teacher recommendations (Appendix B).

Forms of these instruments had been used in evaluation of last year's programs, as well as the Summer Enrichment Program. The above instruments were revised as a result of previous experiences. The teams were familiar with the instruments and made several classroom visits as a team. Then each team member made individual observations.

(2) Music

(a) Music Observation Checklist, five-point scales for the measurement of 19 items of content, 14 items of methods, 17 items of equipment and supplies, and 13 items of outcomes. Each major area also required evaluations and comments by the observer (Appendix B).

(b) Music Observation Summary Scales, five-point scales for recording the observers' summary impressions of teacher competence, instructional, facilities, motivation, realization of general objectives, realization of instructional objectives, and six areas of music instruction (Appendix B).

(3) Art

(a) The Reinforcement of the Curriculum by Classroom Methods (The Relationship of Methods of Instruction to the Fulfillment of Aims and Objectives), a five-point scale for the measurement of items related to the aims and objectives of the art programs, comments, and recommendations by observers (Appendix B).

(b) The Nature and Quality of the Student's Experience in the Classroom, a five-point scale and checklist for the evaluation of the learning activity in relation to the pupil, teacher, physical facilities, materials, and supplies. The instrument contained 73 items, as well as provision for comments and recommendations by the observers (Appendix B).

(4) Health Education

(a) Health Education Evaluation Instrument, an evaluation guide which included requirements for pupil enrollment, program objectives and supervision, offerings, testing, staff, facilities, and equipment (Appendix B).

(b) Checklist for Evaluation of Physical Education Activities, a guide for observing an activity. It requested information from the teacher, evaluated methods of presentation, conducting activity, pupil response, and made provision for teacher comments (Appendix B).

Achievement Data

All achievement data were collected from the Board of Education of New York City. October and April reading scores were collected for a random sample of public school pupils enrolled in the tutorial reading classes. Pretest and posttest reading scores were compared for each grade level.

Class Observations

In all, 72 centers were observed: 26 tutorial centers, 9 art centers, 20 music centers, and 15 health education centers. Each observer submitted a report for each classroom visitation and a summary report covering his impressions of his total visitation schedule.[1]

---

[1] All visitation reports and summary reports are on file at the Center for Urban Education.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

A total of 72 centers and 189 classes were visited and observed. These 189 classes constituted 11 per cent of the tutorial and 13 per cent of the special potential classes in the entire program. Table 3 indicates the number of schools and classes visited, by subject areas.

Table 3

Number of Schools and Number of Classes Visited by Subject Areas

Subject Area	Number of Schools Visited	Number of Classes Visited
Tutorial	28	108
Reading		57
Arithmetic		28
Homework		10
Library		13
Special Potential	44	81
Music		35
Art		28
Health Education		18
Total	72	189

Because of the individual nature of each part of the program, each evaluation team report will be presented as a separate section of the findings. These sections will cover, in order, the tutorial program and the special potential development services in music, art, and health education.

Tutorial Services

The tutorial classes of the A.S.S.C. were designed for children who were retarded a year or more in reading or arithmetic. Special classes were set up to provide remedial instruction in reading or arithmetic. In addition, some classes were organized to offer opportunity for doing homework under the guidance of a teacher, and for instruction in the use of the library. Midway in the year, beginning January 5, 1967, classes were established for non-English-speaking children who needed to learn English as a second language.

Approximately 13,000 pupils from 120 public and 101 nonpublic schools attended classes under the tutorial programs.

Organization of the Evaluation

Two observers visited 28 schools, selected as representative of the five boroughs of the city. A total of 108 classrooms were visited and teachers observed. Table 3 presents the number of classes in each tutorial area and the percentage of classes observed. In addition, center supervisors, nonpublic school personnel, the program coordinator, and field supervisors were interviewed.

Reading scores for October and April were compared for a sample of 1381 public school children participating in the remedial reading classes.[2]

---

[2] Scores for nonpublic school pupils were not available for comparison in time to be included in the survey.

Organization of the Program

Variations in scheduling were found in different schools. In the observed centers, 21 schools had uninterrupted two-hour sessions. Seven other schools, feeling that a two-hour session was unproductive and mitigated against good attendance, obtained permission to alter the program: in two schools, the pupils received one hour of reading and one hour of arithmetic; four other schools utilized one hour for either reading or arithmetic, and for the alternate hour, the pupils were dismissed or admitted to an enrichment course. The two-hour sessions were usually broken by a play period and in some cases the children had snacks.

The homework classes observed had no set schedule. Children left as they finished their homework. Few children were observed taking advantage of the full two hours.

The library programs ran for two-hour sessions in each of the observed schools.

Supervisory Practices

With the exception of eight schools, weekly lesson plans were required of teachers. These were checked, suggestions were made by the supervisor, and the plans were returned to the teacher. In two schools, a log took the place of the lesson plan. Supervisors made supervisory visits to the classrooms. All teachers were required to keep attendance records.

No time was available for conferences of the entire staff except for the first day of the program. One school, however, conducted 15 in-service training sessions at times when the children were dismissed early.

Staff

The 28 schools visited had 226 teachers in the tutorial program; 126 in reading, 39 in arithmetic, 22 in homework, 18 in library. Of these, 193 were regular, licensed teachers, and thirty-three were substitutes. The average length of teaching experience was 7 years for teachers in the reading program, 6 years for teachers in the arithmetic program, 14 years for teachers in the homework program, and 12 years for teachers in the library program.

Pupils

The children were chosen from lists supplied by the public and nonpublic day school teachers. Almost all centers sent letters to the children's homes inviting them to attend the centers. The pupils were supposed to have been retarded one or more years in reading or arithmetic. Some supervisors tried to make the classes mandatory for all severely retarded pupils, but since the program was voluntary, this was not possible. Classes in reading and arithmetic were limited to 15, but some schools registered more, counting on absences and dropouts. When there were more applicants than could be accommodated, a waiting list was employed and pupils were added to replace dropouts.

Grouping

An attempt was made to keep the grade spread within classes as narrow as possible. Classes were usually organized around a two-year grade span, but this was not always feasible, and some centers had to group in wider grade spans. Two of the observed classes in reading had a group spanning grades 2-6. The library and homework classes spanned all grades. Nonpublic and public school pupils were placed in the same classes.

The pupils remained in the classes originally assigned them. One center, however, employed a system of interclass transfers as the pupils progressed. In another center, pupils who, teachers felt, were reading up to grade level were discharged to make room for others.

Attendance

The major problem of the centers was attendance. Attendance was particularly poor on those days when children were excused from school early for religious instruction. Open enrollment pupils and other children living far from the center found the inconvenience of travel discouraging. Many of the children questioned were of the opinion that they were not getting enough from attendance at the centers to compensate giving up their after-school play.

There was great variance in attendance in different areas of the program. The library courses were usually well attended. Homework classes were the most poorly attended. Pupils who came regularly to the reading and arithmetic classes said that they came because they felt they were learning a great deal and they enjoyed coming to class. Snacks, parties, certificates of merit, and reports to parents were all used to help improve attendance.

Facilities

Regular classrooms were used for all classes except for library instruction and homework, which often met in the library. Some teachers who used classrooms other than their own complained about the lack of storage space.

Twelve teachers reported that the furniture in their room was not suitable for the ages of their pupils.

Many schools located the reading and homework classes close to the library so its facilities might be utilized.

Every classroom in reading and arithmetic had at least one bulletin board.

Materials

Each center received a kit of materials and supplies from the Board of Education during the first two weeks of the program. An effort was made to offer different materials from those used in the day sessions.

Reading materials included Readers Digest Skill Builders, Reading Comprehension ABCD, New York, N.Y. S.R.A. Reading Laboratory IIA, Grades 2-7.

Arithmetic kits contained the Schlegel-Learning Skills in Arithmetic.

The S.R.A. And Computational Skill Kits, sent to the centers or loaned to the centers by the home schools, were used with great interest and benefit by children. However, there were too few sets available for use by individual pupils.

All teachers supplemented these materials with those of their own or borrowed from the day-school program. They used teacher-made-mimeographed or rexographed materials which they shared with other classes. Teachers also brought in many mathematics games, word games, and puzzles.

Content

In the 108 classes visited there was a wide variety of lessons observed, both of an individual and group nature. Pupils did independent work with the SRA kits, workbook exercises, and dictionary work, which gave the teachers an opportunity to do remedial work with individual pupils.

There were class activities in reading, story telling, and discussion. Instruction was given in reading, word attack skills, and vocabulary building. One class was observed preparing a newspaper for the center. Other activities included word games, choral reading, play acting, creative writing, and story telling.

Some of the lessons in arithmetic dealt with linear measurement and the development of skills in basic computation, fractions, percentages, interest, liquid measure, and bar graphs. Much of the work was similar to that of the day-school classes. One class was observed making cardboard coins to use in playing store. Manipulative games, models, and pupil-made measuring devices were used.

The homework classes provided a quiet atmosphere for the children to do their work. Reference materials were available in the classroom and the library. It appeared, however, that most of the children who attended the homework classes were the regular day-school pupils of the homework teachers.

The library activities included: story hours, book discussions, films, arts and crafts, music, and the teaching of library skills.

Story hours were supplemented by oral reading, puppet shows based on selected stories, poetry reading, and the recording of children's stories.

Book discussion explored the works of various authors, books or various editions of a book, or illustrations of a story.

Films relating to the content of a story were viewed before and after the reading of the story and then discussed.

Children made booklets, bookmarks, and book jackets. Dioramas and puppets were made for shows about certain books. One of the observed classes was preparing for a puppet show to be shown to the center and to the parents.

Attitudes

All the personnel questioned felt that the program was beneficial for the children who attended regularly. Ten teachers reported that they would have liked a closer communication with the pupils' day school teachers. The observers felt that the subject matter content of many classes was too similar to that of the regular day school classes. Many teachers felt that the children who needed the instruction most were too irregular in their attendance.

Reading Test Results

October and April reading scores on the Metropolitan Reading Achievement Tests were collected for a sample of 1381 public school children who attended the reading classes. Only those children who were present for two-thirds of the class sessions were included in the sample. Table 4 presents the test score data.

Table 4
Means, Standard Deviations and Differences between October and April Reading Test scores for Five-Grades Participating in the After School Study Reading Centers

Grade	Number of Children	October Grade Mean	October Grade S.D.	April Grade Mean	April Grade S.D.	Difference In Month	Gain In Months
2	94	1.6	.3	2.6	.7	10	4
3	372	2.2	.5	3.1	.7	9	3
4	256	3.0	.7	3.7	.9	7	1
5	384	3.5	.8	4.3	1.0	8	2
6	275	4.4	1.1	5.1	1.6	7	1

All grades scored lower on the October test than would be expected for their grade level. Grade two, which should have had a mean of 2.1, had a mean of 1.6, showing a reading discrepancy of 5 months. Since the test was administered after one month of school, the approximate grade level score was computed by taking the grade year and adding one tenth for each month of school. Thus, the expected grade level score for grade three was 3.1. However, the score obtained on the pretest for that grade was only 2.2, leaving a discrepancy of nine months. Grade four scored one year and one month below grade level, grade five scored one year and six months below grade level, and grade 6 scored one year and seven months below grade level on the pretests. Thus the discrepancy consistently increased with each higher grade level.

Progress was made in reading during the school year 1966-1967. A picture of the magnitude of the differences between Metropolitan reading pretests and posttests can be seen by looking at the differences in month units. Pretests were administered in October 1966 and posttests were administered in April 1967. Thus, the mean growth rate expected between pre and posttests was 6 months, a period corresponding to the time between administration of the tests. In grade two, a growth of ten months took place, which is 4 months more progress than expected. In grade three, 9 months' growth took place, or 3 months more than expected. Seven months' progress was observed in grades 4 and 6, which is one month beyond expectation. Grade 5 had 8 months' growth, or 2 months more than expected.

Children continued to maintain their relative class standing on posttests. Correlation coefficients ranging from .49 to .67 demonstrated a significant relationship between the way children scored on the two tests in the five grades. A child who scored relatively high on the pretest, continued to score high on the posttest. A child who scored relatively low on the pretest continued to score relatively low on the posttest.

Scores for the lower grades and for pretests were more consistent than those for the upper grades and posttests. Standard deviations increased for posttests and higher grades. The lowest standard deviation was for grade two pretest scores, while the highest was for grade six posttest scores. This constant increase may be attributed not only to greater variability of scoring among children, but also to the greater number of possible scores obtainable.

An interesting finding in grades three through five was that reading pretest means of one grade level were lower than the reading posttest means of the previous grade level. More specifically, the pretest mean of 2.2 for grade three was in fact lower than the posttest mean of 2.6 for grade two. In grade four, the pretest mean of 3.0 was lower than the grade three posttest mean of 3.1. The same holds true for grade five, which had a pretest mean of 3.5, which was lower than the grade four posttest mean of 3.7. Whether to attribute this finding to summer forgetting or to faster learning rate this year remains a question for further analysis.

It can be concluded that all grades scored below grade level on pretests, with the discrepancy between expected and obtained scores increasing with each higher grade. However, in all grades, Metropolitan reading posttest scores were higher than Metropolitan pretest scores, and the mean rate of progress ranged from 4 months beyond expectation in the lower grades to one month in the higher grades. The lower the grade, the less below grade level the reading means were, and the more progress there was between pretest and posttest. Other findings included the consistency of pupils' relative standing on both pretests and posttests, and the increased variability of scores in the higher grades.

SPECIAL POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Music

The music classes offered classes in instrumental and vocal skills. The objectives of the program were to:

(a) improve children's attitudes toward school

(b) discover and encourage children talented in music

(c) develop the children's appreciation for music

(d) provide a constructive use of leisure time

(e) stimulate community interest through student performances.

Procedures

The evaluation team visited 20 after school study centers chosen at random, but stratified according to the boroughs where they were located in the city. The sample included 35 teachers, located in five centers in Manhattan, five in the Bronx, six in Brooklyn, three in Queens, and one in Richmond.

The general research prospectus was followed and a report was submitted for each visit. One consultant held interviews with teachers during the school visitations, while the other interviewed the Study Center supervisors.

The evaluation team attended workshops for teachers, meetings of the Board of Education field supervisors and administrative personnel and of nonpublic-school liaison personnel; the team also met with the music coordinator during the year. This made possible a view of the program at all levels and provided information about the overall organization.

General Considerations

The purpose of this evaluation was to determine whether the students were receiving effective musical experiences in the classroom, in accordance with program objectives. Experience has shown that the classroom situation is frequently dependent on other aspects of organization. Consequently, the following considerations were included in the evaluation:

1. Was there a clear understanding of the program objectives at the administrative and planning levels, and were these objectives adequately communicated to all personnel?

2. Were sufficient guidelines for achieving the objectives communicated to the supervisors and teachers?

3. Was there adequate communication and participation between the Board of Education and the nonpublic-school administrative and liaison personnel?

4. Did parents understand the program sufficiently to encourage their children to attend?

5. Were specific considerations and techniques for teaching music to disadvantaged children defined and communicated throughout the program?

6. Did study center supervisors and teachers feel that the program was effective and that it did, in fact, meet the needs of disadvantaged children?

7. Was attendance sufficiently regular to allow continuity in the classroom?

8. What specific procedures and content were being employed in the classroom?

9. Were the children developing competencies which would allow them to use their own initiative in participating in further musical experiences?

Physical Situation

Schedules varied in different schools according to the needs and requirements of the particular school. Of the 20 centers observed, 15 followed a schedule of three two-hour class meetings a week. One center had one-hour sessions three days a week, and four centers had two-hour sessions which met only two days per week.

Those centers which met only twice a week did so because they could not find teachers who were available on all three days. The school which scheduled one-hour periods alternated pupils between the tutorial and enrichment classes each day. The center supervisor felt that a two-hour class period was too long for the pupils and therefore divided classes into two groups, each meeting for an hour.

Number of Pupils

Approximately 6,000 pupils were enrolled in the music classes. In the centers included in the sample, the average class size was 15 . One class had 30 and one had only 10 children.

Interviews with supervisors suggested that small enrollments were due to lack of interest on the part of parents and, in some cases, on the part of the sending school personnel. Other reasons elicited by interviews were the late afternoon time of the classes, the travel distance between the public and nonpublic schools, and scheduling conflicts. The observed classes were of adequate size for the available materials and for effective teaching, allowing for both group activities and individual attention.

In the sample centers, the majority of pupils were from public schools. The Supervisor of Music of the Brooklyn Diocese commented that the pupils were not sufficiently motivated to attend on their own, but needed repeated encouragement from their schools and homes.

Grouping

In programs of previous years students of all grade levels were often included in one general music class, resulting in too wide a spread of interests and abilities. In this year's sample, those schools which had only general vocal music divided their programs into two classes, one for older and one for younger pupils. All the observed instrumental programs were restricted to the older pupils. Younger children were placed in vocal classes. This arrangement seemed best suited to the interests and maturity of the pupils. All but three of the instrumental programs were divided into two groups, beginning and advanced. This was necessary because some children did not attend regularly or entered the program later in the year and were behind the rest of the class in proficiency.

Facilities

Classrooms were not entirely adequate for all music activities. This was due to the fact that specially equipped music rooms do not exist in many of the New York City elementary schools. Of 30 classrooms visited, only 14 had pianos and few had acceptable record playing equipment. There were few music stands. In general, the observed teachers showed remarkable ingenuity in working with available facilities.

Personnel

The project director and coordinator carried out a well-organized program. Personnel at all levels were informed of the objectives of the program and were well supplied with instructional materials. Certain innovations, such as a workshop in teaching music to disadvantaged children and expanded instrumental music classes, strengthened the program. Guidelines, a monograph issued to all teachers by the coordinator at the beginning of the program, set the procedures for the classroom.

The field supervisors were licensed department chairmen. Twelve field supervisors provided assistance to the teachers in the centers. Each field supervisor served ten schools. Since most schools had more than one teacher, the time that the supervisors could devote to each class was limited. They observed classes, gave demonstration lessons, and assisted the teacher in developing classroom techniques.

Many of the teachers benefited from the opportunity to discuss the classroom situation and methods with the supervisor, but the schedule did not allow time for much individual help. It was difficult for the supervisor to speak with a teacher while the children were present since that encroached into the already limited class period; nor was time allowed for discussion before or after class. Some supervisors were able to organize a few group discussion or workshop sessions for teachers on days when classes did not meet, teachers seemed to appreciate these occasions. The supervisors felt that much more time should have been provided in the program for them to work with teachers.

Teachers were secondary school music specialists or common branch teachers with some music training. Those teaching instrumental music in the observed classes were licensed in junior high school instrumental music and had music degrees. They were assigned to programs where they could teach their major instrument. The teachers who participated in the program were selected on recommendation from the supervisors, principals, and the co-ordinator. Occasionally travel was a problem in assigning teachers to particular schools.

A basic problem in the organization of the program was that of obtaining qualified teachers. Many teachers did not want to teach in the after-school classes because of the length of the teaching day. In addition, there are few elementary school music teachers in the city system. Thus, most of the vocal teachers were elementary school common branch teachers. This emphasized the need for increasing the supervisory and teacher training aspects of the program through workshops, discussions, and detailed curriculum guides.

Content, Methods, and Activities

The observed classroom situations were largely based on procedures which individual teachers were accustomed to using, and on the available materials. In general vocal music, a few teachers were able to teach a variety of concepts, encouraging student initiative through a number of different activities. Many teachers, however, limited the concepts they presented primarily to melody and rhythm taught through isolated exercises in singing or in playing rhythm instruments or song flutes. The greatest uniformity of practice was found when a common book, such as the song flute book was used throughout the program. The teaching of orchestral instruments tended to be even more dependent on the customary approach of individual teachers.

Certain fundamentals should be found in all classrooms. In general music, the content should deal with concepts of melody, rhythm, harmony, form, expression, and style. All of the following activities should be employed in developing skills and discrimination: analytical listening; singing with good quality; playing instruments accurately; rhythmical movement; associating symbols with tones, beats, and duration; and creating new musical experiences based on the skills and knowledge gained. The Guidelines issued initially by the project coordinator illustrated such an approach and should be expanded into a complete curriculum. Workshops, similar to one given at the beginning of the program, would be valuable in demonstrating this approach to the teachers.

The classes in orchestral instruments need to be structured so that the students progressively develop control of individual skills. Frequently, teachers expected students to coordinate too many skills at once. Further demonstration lessons for the teachers would be helpful.

Five of the observed centers had given or were planning to give concerts for the parents and community. Seven had given concerts for the children in the centers.

Of the 35 teachers observed, only five were reported by the team members to be unsatisfactory. One of these teachers was later replaced. Seven teachers were reported to be above average in both content and methods.

There was agreement among teaching, supervisory, and administrative personnel that the music program was valuable and met the needs of disadvantaged children for enrichment and achievement.

ART

Art classes were conducted for public and nonpublic school children of elementary school age in 127 afterschool study centers. About 10,750 pupils were selected as eligible for the overall program.

Objectives

In a memo from the art project director to all supervisors and art teachers, the following objectives were stated:

(a) To improve children's attitudes toward school.

(b) To discover and encourage children talented in art.

(c) To provide all children with a nonverbal means of expressing personal ideas and feelings.

(d) To provide a constructive use of leisure time.

(e) To stimulate community interest through exhibitions of children's work.

(f) To encourage reading about art and artists.

(g) To increase understanding of the needs of the deprived child; to design the art experience so as to meet these needs.

Assumptions (1) The consultants assumed that the program would conform to the project description. (2) They assumed, also, that the program benefited from the experience of last spring and summer when similar Title I programs were administered by the Art Department of the Board of Education.

Scope of the Evaluation Two art consultants were retained to design instruments, plan the art evaluation, and conduct extensive interviews with administrators, supervisors, teachers, and art specialists. They visited the AfterSchool Study Centers to observe the program in operation. Research was also conducted into the nature of other federally assisted art programs in the United States.

PROCEDURES OF THE ART EVALUATION

The Art Evaluation Team checklist (Appendix B) was revised in the light of last year's experience. A new Summary Graph evaluation instrument resulted (Appendix B). A third instrument was devised based on material suggested in "The Use of Art in Compensatory Education Projects,"[2] published by the Urban Child Center of the University of Chicago.

A teacher questionnaire was devised to measure teacher background, attitude toward the disadvantaged child, and reaction to this year's ASSC (Appendix B).

An attempt was made to concentrate on innovations in teaching technique, teacher-pupil relations, and student activities appropriate to the disadvantaged child. Stress was placed on interviews with art supervisors of outstanding ability, with artist-teachers, with administrative personnel, with liaison personnel to the nonpublic schools, United Federation of Teachers Union Officials, and on visits to programs of similar nature in nearby communities. School visits were limited on the assumption that greater value could be gained from the other techniques listed above.

After School Study Center Visits by Evaluation Team

Nine school visits were made by the two consultants simultaneously.

---

[2] "The Use of Art in Compensatory Education Projects," Urban Child Center, University of Chicago, 1966.

One consultant made a written evaluation report for each school; the other consultant interviewed the ASSC principal and the art teacher, and talked informally with students in the art class.

Teacher Attitude Toward Classroom Facilities

Forty-one teachers out of 66 reported that their classroom was attractive and that other facilities were excellent; 13 teachers reported the classroom adequate but unattractive; only 12 respondents reported the classroom as too small and poorly equipped. Forty-eight teachers reported that classroom and facilities suited the age range of their pupils while 18 felt the facilities were unsuitable.

Consultant Observation on Classroom Facilities

Of the nine schools visited, six were rated average or below and only three classrooms were rated above average, although the consensus obtained from questionnaires, interviews, and observations was that, in contrast to previous enrichment programs, most of the rooms provided were well suited to art activities. They were equipped with sinks, had proper furniture (movable desks and work tables), and the rooms were well lighted.

Exhibition and Storage Space

Teachers reported that only 18 out of 66 classrooms had adequate exhibition space and only 20 out of 66 classrooms had adequate storage space. As indicated by the evaluation team's own observations and through interviews with principals, supervisors, and classroom teachers, storage and exhibition facilities for the after-school program were inadequate. Often, lack of storage space, particularly for three-dimensional projects, seriously inhibited the program, limiting the kinds of art experience that were feasible.

It appeared that these matters were left to the individual ASSC principals and teachers to resolve. There was a great disparity in the results reported. Usually the ASSC art teacher was from another school and existing facilities often had to be shared with day school programs. Sometimes, supplies intended for the ASSC teacher became mixed with day school supplies. Friction often resulted with day school personnel.

In the final months, an effort was made, by the program supervisors at the Board of Education, to distribute storage closets for ASSC use exclusively. It is recommended that this equipment be made available to future programs.

Art Supplies and Equipment

An excellent and varied list of materials was ordered for each ASSC. In addition, each teacher was funded a personal purchase allotment of ten dollars. Vigorous steps were taken by the Art Bureau to assure early arrival of supplies.

Teacher Appraisal of Supply and Equipment Availability

Of 66 teachers responding, eight teachers reported equipment very adequate, 39 adequate, and 19 less than adequate. In terms of books, equipment, and materials, 27 teachers reported no shortages, 18 few shortages, and 21 reported severe shortages. By way of contrast, 34 reported that they brought in a large amount of personal materials, 20 brought in some materials, and 12 reported they brought in little or no supplies.

Consultant Evaluation of supply and equipment situation

Despite continuing problems with the late distribution of essential supplies combined with difficulties of handling and storage of these supplies in the ASSC, the overall situation was improved greatly over previous Title I art programs. The supply list was expanded, including many items not previously offered. Coincidental with this, there has been a welcome emphasis placed on innovations in technique as well as on approach by the Art Department. It was disappointing to hear from department supervisors that teachers had not taken advantage of the discretionary funds available to them. Increased realization that this money is available to them as well as orientation and followup by their supervisors would insure proper expenditure of this newly acquired resource.

Influence of Board of Education Policy on Program

(1) Current policy required that all students in the ASSC's must be at grade level in reading before they might be admitted to other than the remedial reading after-school courses. In practice this requirement may have eliminated many disadvantaged children from the after-school enrichment program. (2) The reduction of salary of some art teachers, equalizing it with those of other specialists, created some dissatisfaction.

The Role of the Art Coordinator

The art coordinator inaugurated and emphasized the quest for innovation in the ASSC's. The hiring of artist-teachers; the careful dissemination of information about the disadvantaged child to supervisors and teachers; the introduction of discretionary supply funds for individual teachers; and the seeking out of new techniques and materials to aid the teacher, all indicated vital and imaginative leadership. Other activities such as conferences on the disadvantaged at the Museum of Modern Art, the extensive purchase of the Weekly Reader art appreciation kits, and the expanded exhibition schedule of ASSC children's art works indicated the practice of sound administration.

The Role of the ASSC Supervisor

Often the ASSC supervisor was distracted from his work of supervision by menial clerical and policing tasks. In general, the supervisor ranked second only to the teachers in his contribution to the success of the after-school centers. In some measure, he conditioned the teacher's effectiveness, since he was the source of essential support, services, and supervision. His recommendations were sought on staffing decisions, when qualified teachers were not available. The lack of certification of elementary education art specialists sometimes limited him in selecting proper staff.

It is safe to conclude that, to a considerable extent, each school situation reflected the supervisor's energy and outlook, and these varied widely, with little guidance from the Board of Education. Some supervisors were convinced of the value of art in a child's development, while many others felt that the art activity was peripheral to the remedial programs. A few supervisors exercised imagination and initiative in structuring their study centers to respond to needs, even permitting children to spend one hour in remedial classes and one in art or music, if they wished, so as to maintain participation by many children who would otherwise not attend at all. But the majority simply followed directives.

The Role of the Field Supervisor

The field supervisors represent one of the project's strongest supports. They were knowledgeable and dedicated educators who performed the necessary function of liaison between the Board of Education and the classroom teachers. They implemented the goals of the program through the vehicle of

(1) visits to the schools to observe each teacher several times during the school year, (2) teacher training conferences where teachers shared mutual problems, (3) maintaining rapport with the ASSC supervisor, and, (4) in some cases, publishing an excellent monthly newsletter on how the program was functioning, innovations observed in the schools, and other information.

Background of the Field Supervisors

All of the 12 field supervisors were high school art chairmen. Elementary level art supervisors could not serve as advisors to the ASSC program because their official duties did not end until five P.M.

Need for Teacher Training Workshops and Conference Time for Meetings between the Field Supervisor and the Art Teacher

If the field supervisor wished to confer with an art teacher, he had to steal time from the teacher's classroom duties. Teacher training would be improved with more extensive workshops conducted by personnel thoroughly experienced with elementary art problems.

Criteria for Selection of Teachers

The Art Bureau established excellent criteria for the selection of qualified ASSC art personnel. In many cases, qualified applicants were simply not available for two hours of duty per day commencing at 3:15 in the afternoon. In the absence of qualified personnel, day and after-school elementary principals made recommendations for staffing. Often, these decisions were based on the principal's familiarity with personnel in his own school; usually the elementary art teacher was a common branch teacher with interest in art but with few qualifications for teaching it.

Background of Art Teachers in ASSC Program, 1966-67

Of the 66 respondents, 41 taught in the New York City day school program. Of these 41, 20 taught ASSC classes in the same day school while 21 taught in other day schools. Sixteen teachers were male and 50 female. Sixty-one respondents reported that most held full-time day school positions; only five did not. Of this group, 42 held regular day school licenses and 24 were substitutes.

Forty-two teachers reported that they taught on the elementary level; 19 were secondary teachers, and five had licenses on more than one level.

Forty respondents reported that they taught art in the day school and 26 taught other subjects.

Ten teachers taught only one day per week in the ASSC program, four taught two days, and 52 taught all three days.

General Evaluation of Staffing of the AfterSchool Study Center Art Program

Teacher questionnaires, consultant interviews with teachers and supervisors, and consultant visits to schools indicated that staffing of this year's program was good. The quality of the student work observed indicated that the program was successful in terms of teaching performance.

Role of the Art Bureau in Strengthening Teaching Performance

The National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children stated in a report dated November 25, 1966:

> For the most part, projects (for the disadvantaged) are piecemeal, fragmented efforts at remediation or vaguely directed enrichment. It is extremely rare to find strategically planned, comprehensive programs or change.

The Art Department took strong steps to advise teachers on the particular problems of the disadvantaged child. An essay by Millard H. Black on the "Characteristics of the Culturally Disadvantaged Child," and material from the book entitled, Art Education for the Disadvantaged Child by Jane Neale, was distributed to each teacher. Supervisors were provided with copies of "The Use of Art in Compensatory Education Projects," published by the Urban Child Center of the University of Chicago.

Conference on Art for the Disadvantaged

On February 25, 1967, a conference was held at the Museum of Modern Art for all teachers in the program to deal with problems of art for the disadvantaged. This program was well attended.

Assessment of Teaching Methods and Performance

Consultant classroom observers, although limited in this evaluation, found the qulity of teaching performance to be very good. Interviews with supervisors and administrators tended to reinforce this impression.[3] Many outstanding teachers participated in this program and the excellent results were due primarily to their performance.

Teacher Reports on Classroom Organization: In response to the question, "Do you find that children in your classes work better in a permissive, partially structured, or highly structured classroom environment?" 14 teachers reported that a permissive environment was preferable, 47 preferred a partly structured classroom, and 8 preferred a highly structured classroom.

---

[3] All interviews are on file at the Center for Urban Education.

Curriculum Provided by the Art Department

An excellent series of suggested projects were conveyed to the art teachers from the Art Department. As noted above, the supply kits furnished to the teachers made it possible for them to experiment widely with materials and new techniques.

Nature of Art Activities

Projects were conducted in all areas of art experience; painting, drawing, stitchery, collage, assemblage, weaving, mosaics, paper maché sculpture, puppetry, wood assemblage sculpture, masks, mobiles, ceramics, and plaster of paris were used.

Appropriateness of Projects in Motivating the Disadvantaged Child

When teachers were asked what projects were particularly successful in motivating the disadvantaged child, they replied as follows: murals (2 teachers suggested this project), three-dimensional projects (14), infinite variety (1), paper maché (19), puppets (18), painting (32), stitchery (10), collage (14), woodcraft (11), masks (2), two-dimensional art of all types (1), large walk-in sculpture (1), soap sculpture (4), drawing (2), paper mosaics (2), glass mosaics (1), plaster of paris (2), ceramics (1), weaving (8), crayons (2), paper sculpture (3), wire sculpture (2), and crafts (2).

General Evaluation of Art Activities

The range and depth of art activities was excellent in this program, in the opinion of the evaluators who visited these classes.

Attendance

Attendance varied widely from center to center, generally responsive to two main factors:

(1) The individual teacher

(2) The quality and degree of personal effort in promoting the program made by principals and teachers, including repeated direct contact with parents, nonpublic school principals and teachers, and frequent announcements and posted displays, etc., to interest children.

Class Compositions

Class size ranged from fewer than 10 to as many as 30 students, with the elementary grades from 2nd through 6th being represented, the majority of students coming from the upper three grades. There were more girls than boys, in a ratio of better than 3 to 2.

NonPublic and Public School Attendance

Patterns of attendance of public and nonpublic school children differed. The former showed a progressive improvement as a whole, whereas the latter, originally less than 39 per cent of the total, declined considerably with the advent of winter's early darkness and bad weather, and picked up again somewhat during the spring. The nonpublic school representation never quite returned to its beginning level, however, and toward the end of the program approximated one-third of the total number participating. Nonpublic school students had to travel to the Afterschool Centers while many public school children were already in their school.

Grade Levels Served

Seven teachers taught only grade levels two to four in the ASSC's; four teachers taught only grades four to six; and 55 teachers reported that their classes consisted of children from grades two to six.

Estimated Total Attendance in Program

The art bureau reported that 376,250 pupil sessions were held in art during this year's program. Approximately 11,000 pupils were served.

Teacher Estimation of Student Motivation

Fifty-four teachers reported that students were highly motivated and entered into activities enthusiastically, 18 teachers reported that students were motivated fairly well, and two teachers reported that children did not participate well. Many teachers added the comment that they found work with disadvantaged children especially rewarding.

Quality of the Program

The After-School Study Centers provided a rich and varied experience in art for thousands of disadvantaged New York City school children.

Needless to say, in a program of such vast scope, quality of instruction and depth of experience will vary considerably. As was expected, the ability of the classroom art teacher to motivate her children was the overriding single factor in producing successful results. However, classroom observations, interviews with administrators, principals, art supervisors, art teachers, art specialists, and participating children all tended to reinforce the strong impression that this program was successful in achieving voluntary and enthusiastic attendance by disadvantaged children of elementary school age.

Supplies and Equipment

Adequate materials were made available to the classroom art teacher to provide a varied, well conceived art experience. The supply list was expanded to include many items not previously offered. Also, there was an emphasis placed on innovations in techniques, as well as approach, by the art bureau.

Assessment of the Art Work

There was a wide range and variety of products from this program. Much of the success might be attributed to sound preplanning of supplies made available to the teachers. The esthetic quality of the works produced was high; it was a result of highly creative and inventive student effort. Such results suggest that disadvantaged children, through such programs, can produce art work of a quality equal to that done by more advantaged children.

Innovations of the AfterSchool Center Art Program

(1) The introduction of an artist-consultant to the program, a visiting creative artist with whom children of similar ethnic background might identify, was an outstanding success. Interviews with Raymond Saunders, the first such artist-consultant, and discussions with supervisors indicated that this addition to the program may ultimately prove to be one of its significant features.

(2) The experiment to engage Leonard Meiselman to teach and recruit children to make a sculptured mural for the New York City "vest-pocket" parks was an excellent extension of this program into the community.

(3) The extended range of supplies made available to teachers, including the discretionary teacher supply fund (although not adequately utilized by teachers), was an innovation which should be continued, with concerted supervisory efforts to show teachers how to utilize these extra funds effectively.

Art Exhibitions

Many exhibits were held in local AfterSchool Study Centers. Other exhibitions were held by participating nonpublic schools. Final shows at the end of the school year in public libraries, public parks, and at the Board of Education were planned to bring the works before the public.

Recommendations

Staffing of Art Field Supervisors: The art field supervisor is one key to the success of the After School Study Centers for art. He should be able to conduct teacher-training workshops for the many relatively inexperienced art teachers who staff this program. He should also be able to give demonstrations in the classrooms, working with disadvantaged children on the elementary level. At present, Board of Education regulations preclude the participation of trained elementary art field supervisors because their day school duties do not end until 5 P.M. Although the present supervisors, who are high school chairmen, are well trained in art for all academic levels, and many have elementary art backgrounds it would seem that they might benefit from contact with some practicing elementary level art supervisors. As openings occur for art supervisory positions next year, the Board of Education might consider making provision for elementary level art field supervisors to service part of the after school study center art program.

Conference Time for Teachers to Meet with Art Field Supervisors: At present, art field supervisors visit each ASSC at least twice during the school year. Perhaps arrangements could be made to dismiss the art classes early occasionally, so that the field supervisors might confer with the art teacher.

Staffing of Teachers: The present guidelines for choosing the art staff should be adequate. When personnel with proper qualifications are not available, school principals' recommendations to the Art Department are the only means of recruiting staff. The art consultant staff of the evaluation team recommends two possible improvements:

(1) Recommendations by day school elementary art supervisors should be considered in addition to principals' recommendations for staffing.

(2) Ultimately, the Board of Education should provide for licensing of elementary art specialists. Licensing of elementary art specialists would provide for adequate staffing of both day and afterschool art programs.

Staffing of Artist-Teachers: This innovation should be expanded next year. The artist-teacher gave the children of the afterschool study centers the opportunity to experience, directly in a classroom situation and on supervised field trips, the unique attributes of the creative artist. If possible, a number of these artist-teachers should be male because of the particular need for such identification among disadvantaged boys. One artist-teacher should be assigned to each art supervisor to circulate among the schools in his district.

Recruiting and Hiring of Community Advisors in the Humanities: The program in the humanities offered on the elementary level by art director Leo C. Irrera in the Newburgh Public Schools has proved to be a bold, new step in educational concepts designed to deal with elementary level disadvantaged children. The evaluation team visited this program and concluded that it offers unique advantages. The conscious relating of art experiences to the broader scope of humanities including poetry, literature, music, and social history may eventually strengthen all programs which deal with poor children. In this context, the authors suggest the following innovations for next year's AfterSchool Study Centers in Art: Negro and Puerto Rican adult males with high school diplomas and demonstrated ability to work effectively in art with elementary school children, might be hired as community advisors in the humanities to function in cooperation with art supervisors, artist-teachers, and classroom art teachers. Their duties would be to visit the after-school study centers on a rotating basis to lecture on art, demonstrate art and craft techniques, and accompany after-school center teachers and children on Saturday field trips. The participation of intelligent, successful, adult Negro and Puerto Rican males in this program could serve to provide models with whom the disadvantaged children, particularly boys, in the program might relate.

Field Trips: Funds should be made available to remunerate all after-school center art teachers, artist-teachers, and community advisors in the humanities, to enable them to conduct Saturday field trips to museums, art exhibitions, sketching and painting trips, and other appropriate cultural activities. The values of these excursions outside the ghetto cannot be overestimated. Too often the disadvantaged child never ventures beyond his immediate neighborhood. A program of out of school cultural events has been inaugurated in Chicago by the Institute for Cultural Development and the Chicago School Board.[4] This program stressed field trips outside the school neighborhood. A subjective evaluation by teachers and principals was made. Findings indicated that pupil attitudes toward school were improved, as was motivation toward academic programs.

Location of the Study Centers: A pilot program should be funded to locate key after-school study centers in housing developments and perhaps store fronts where the disadvantaged child actually resides. The Head Start projects offer a successful precedent. Present after-school centers located in public schools often fail to attract the "hard core" disadvantaged child. It was evident that participation by nonpublic school children under present circumstances was light. The home situation in families, where the mother works to support her children, often precludes their participation in any activity taking place at an inconvenient distance from the home.

If these centers could be located conveniently, it seems possible that many more "hard core" disadvantaged children could be induced to enter the program. Administrative and custodial supervision would have to be established and maintained if such neighborhood centers are to be successful.

Discretionary Funds for Art Supplies: This program should be continued and its potential made apparent to each art teacher.

---

[4] Correspondence with Mrs. James H. Woods, Executive Director of Urban Gateways, Institute for Cultural Development, 1425 South Racine Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, 60608, March 31, 1967.

Photographic Supplies for Program: The suggestion has been made by administrators and art specialists that the addition of photography to the after-school art program would be of great value. Such an activity could go far in developing perceptual and esthetic awareness, and a different outlook upon the visual world.

Additional Aides for the ASSC's: School principals often were distracted from administrative duties by problems of policing the halls. Perhaps nonprofessional help, such as teacher aides from the neighborhood, might be recruited to help in this capacity.

HEALTH EDUCATION

Evaluative Procedure

A stratified random sample of 15 schools was selected for evaluation. The sample for each borough was proportionate to the number of Title I Health Education Programs in the borough: Brooklyn, 5 schools; Manhattan, 5 schools; Bronx, 3 schools; Queens, 1 school; and, Richmond 1 school.

There were three evaluators; all were experienced teachers of physical education.

A survey form (Appendix B) was developed and distributed to the 15 schools in the sample. These forms were filled out by teachers employed in the Title I Health Education Programs. Most of the information sought on the survey form reflected the expressed intent of the health education program as described in the "Application for Federal Assistance...", and in the series of bulletins issued by the Board of Education Project Coordinator for Health Education.

Each of the 15 schools was visited by a member of the evaluation team. The evaluator collected the survey form and checked on its accuracy and completeness. In addition, the evaluator systematically observed and assessed the ongoing program on the day of the visitation. A guide for the "Evaluation of the Conduct of Physical Education Activities" (Appendix B) was developed for use by the evaluators. The guide directed the evaluators to observe and assess the content of the instructional program, the teacher's performance, the organization of the teaching situation, the use of facilities and equipment, and the conduct of other supervised activities. The validity of the data collected was limited in that a good deal of it was based on the subjective judgments and estimates made by the teachers who filled out the survey forms.

Health Education

The chief purpose of the special potential classes in health education was to improve the physical fitness of disadvantaged children. The program was to be educational in nature.

Variability Among Programs

There was considerable variation in the content, organization, and conduct of the programs studied. They ranged in quality from very good to very poor.

Teaching Personnel

Of the 28 teachers imployed in the 15 programs, 11 were licensed teachers in health education. Interestingly enough, however, there appeared to be little relationship between the presence of specialists and the quality of instruction (as judged by the evaluators). In part, this seemed to be due to the fact that the specialists came from the secondary schools and had difficulty adapting their methods and content to the needs and abilities of elementary school children.

The Quality and Quantity of Instruction

Judgments about observed teaching performance varied considerably. In five instances the teaching was good, in three cases the teaching was poor, in two schools the program was recreational and no teaching took place, and in the remaining five schools it was moderately effective.

In a few programs the instructional setting was well organized to provide for effective student control and efficient learning. In the majority of schools, however, the organization of the instructional setting was deficient. The more common reasons were: (1) organizing practice in such a way that students spent almost all their time waiting their turn (i.e., inactive); (2) inability to effectively control pupil behavior - in part due to poor facilities and interference from other groups; (3) utilizing techniques of control applicable to large classes of high school students, but not to small groups of elementary students; and (4) failure to group students according to age level and ability.

Although the program was supposed to be instructional and not recreational (according to policy statements), the data suggest that this was not always the case. Nine schools reported that they devoted 50 per cent or less of the program time to instruction. The great majority of the programs devoted a small part of the two-hour session to instruction -- even less time than was indicated by the teachers on the survey form. A few teachers believed that the program should be recreational and conducted their sessions accordingly. It may be unrealistic to expect that a two-hour afterschool program in physical education can be devoted primarily to instruction. In planning future programs, a policy decision on this moot question is recommended.

The pupils' response to the instruction offered seemed to vary with the quality of the instruction. The few outstanding instructional sessions yielded enthusiastic student response. In the remaining programs the students' response ranged from tolerant to disinterested to rebellious. For the most part, however, the students appeared satisfied with those portions of the program where they were allowed to "play games by themselves."

Physical Fitness

Two of the major objectives of the program were: (1) "to identify the underdeveloped pupil by administering the national (P.C.Y.F.) physical fitness screening test," and (2) "to provide experiences for the underdeveloped pupil which will help him achieve fitness status." Eleven schools administered the test, and five were able to identify the students who failed. Two of these schools provided individualized programs to improve the fitness level of the failures. Of the 1377 registered pupils in the 15 schools, there was a record of only 18 failures - i.e., underdeveloped pupils. This would seem to indicate that either the test was not appropriate, or there were not many underdeveloped pupils in the program, or the testing was not carefully administered. A combination of these three factors was probably at work. In any event, a total reexamination of this phase of the program is called for.

In 12 of the 15 schools visited, the observed program consisted, in part, of 10 to 20 minutes of group calisthenics. In about half of these programs the exercises were appropriate for students and were judged to be of value. In the other half, the exercises were inappropriate, or poorly directed, or the students simply "went through the motions."

If fitness training is to play a large part in the enrichment program, and if it is to have value for students, a great deal more energy and imagination will need to be devoted to the design of the training program. The haphazard administration of a simple fitness test, and an occasional group exercise will not suffice.

Other Activities in the Program

According to survey responses, about half the schools offered a reasonable variety of physical education activities. A few schools offered an extensive variety, while a few other schools concentrated almost exclusively on the team sports of volleyball and basketball, and leadup games to these sports. In general, highly organized team games were emphasized (basketball, volleyball, and softball). Individual sports (track and field, gymnastics, etc.), dance, and games of low organization received less attention. There was a tendency to offer activities that one might expect to find in secondary school physical education programs instead of such activities which are a normal part of elementary school physical education.

Although 13 schools claimed to have used the bulletin "Physical Education Activities for the Elementary Schools" as a guide in planning activities, the activities actually offered did not reflect this use.

A few programs were developed through careful planning. In the majority of schools, however, this does not seem to have been the case. Eight schools had no written plan of activities.

Supervision

All schools had been visited relatively frequently by members of the supervisory staff. In almost all cases the teachers credited the supervisors with having provided valuable assistance. The evaluators, however, felt the need for more and closer supervision.

Facilities

In six schools the indoor area was quite inadequate (e.g., lunchroom, basement playroom, classroom) for the purpose of carrying out an "enrichment" program. (In several cases these supplementary spaces had to be used because the community center recreation program used the gymnasium.) In two additional schools, the Title I program was forced to share a gymnasium with the community center recreation program. In both instances the sharing severely limited the operation of the Title I program. In almost all of these eight schools the limited facilities virtually precluded the possibility of conducting a well-rounded health education program.

According to survey responses, seven schools reported conflict between their Title I program and a community center program for the use of facilities; in all cases the conflict resulted in limiting the scope and quality of the Title I program. Obviously, there is a need to avoid such conflict in the future.

Equipment

In the majority of schools the available equipment was adequate in variety and quantity. In a few instances, however, the equipment did not arrive until April.

Suprisingly enoubh, there was a notable under-use of the equipment available in seven schools, for example, using one basketball for 16 pupils, when five or six additional balls were available. This reflected the general approach to instruction that was found in several programs, i.e., one or two students practiced at a time, while the others watched.

Administrative Factors

Most administrative features of the program were well cared for. Virtually all schools kept attendance records, had medical consent forms on file, and had procedures for obtaining medical assistance. For the most part adequate steps were taken to provide for the safety of the pupils.

Attendance

Although precise figures to estimate attendance trends were not always immediately available, several of the 15 programs suffered appreciable decrements in pupil attendance during the year. In particular, there was a substantial drop in attendance among girls and among nonpublic-school pupils.

The decline in female pupils may well have been due to the nature of the programs offered at the schools. In most cases, the activities and the instruction were not of the type that would be attractive to girls.

The problem of nonpublic-school pupils' attendance seems to be more involved. A variety of factors were mentioned by teachers to account for the decline. This problem should be given serious attention in the future.

Improvement in Comparison with the 1965-66 Title I Program

It seems advisable to take note of several improvements in this year's program compared with last year's. The most notable ones are:

(1) More frequent attempts to provide meaningful instruction.

(2) More awareness on the part of teachers of the purposes and policies which direct the program.

(3) More and better equipment.

(4) Health records were maintained for all pupils.

Suggestions

One fact seems clear, the decision to continue the Title I AfterSchool Health Education Program should be contingent upon assurances that significant improvements can be made. Future programs should provide for more teachers trained in elementary health education.

Programs should not be offered in schools where proper physical facilities are not available. If the program is to be remedial in nature, space must be provided for special remedial activities: Centers should not be set up in schools where a competing community physical education Program is being conducted.

Consideration should be given to such activities as dance and other programs of interest to girls which could be oriented toward physical fitness as well as recreational in nature.

It may be worthwhile to consider reducing the size of the total undertaking to insure better quality in the programs that are offered.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The After School Study Centers offered classes in remedial reading, remedial arithmetic, homework, library, English as a second language, music, art, and health education. Approximately 30,000 children attended these classes throughout the school year. A total of 1,570 classes were set up in 12[illegible] public and 5 nonpublic school buildings. The classes offered instruction to disadvantaged children from both public and nonpublic schools. Classes generally met three days a week for two hours each day.

One of the most crucial problems facing the centers was that of pupil attendance. Attendance in the program was entirely voluntary. This was good in the respect that it forced the teachers to innovate, and to constantly motivate the children to continue in the program. However, there were many other factors affecting attendance. Pupils excused early on Wednesdays for religious instruction often did not return for the after school classes. During the winter months, many parents did not want their children coming home after dark. Many nonpublic schools stopped sending children to the after school centers when day school programs in reading and arithmetic classes were set up in their own schools under another Title I program. The observers felt that there was still inadequate articulation between the public and nonpublic schools and that many nonpublic school principals and parents were not fully aware of the programs available to their children.

Attendance tended to lag again toward the end of the year. It might be advisable to end the program in April rather than May so that the classes would not have to compete with outdoor recreation.

In many centers, the supervisor spent a large portion of his time in hall supervision and clerical details. It would be advisable to hire school aides for this purpose. These aides could be recruited from the community, and could also be used to meet the children at the feeder schools, accompany them to the center and then back to the feeder school. This might serve to increase nonpublic school attendance.

In some centers there was a conflict for use of space between Community Education Programs and the After School Study Centers. Such conflicts should be resolved in the planning stage of the program.

Continuous service of supervisor and teacher would be desirable. The apparent benefits of continuous consistent supervision and continuous consistent teaching are destroyed when split assignments are permitted.

Centers should be allowed time for staff conferences. Such items as objectives, lesson plans, and program scheduling could then be discussed.

The observers found many improvements over last year's program:

Materials were adequate and were recieved in time for the program.

Attendance lists were kept and feeder schools were appraised of those children not attending the classes.

Facilities were generally good. Some centers still lacked adequate storage space.

Teachers were licensed by the Board of Education but were not always trained for the level at which they were teaching. The ASSC supervisors and field supervisors, however, gave the teachers as much help as was possible through workshops, printed materials, and supervision.

Pupil attendance, while erratic, was greatly improved over last year's rate, and both teachers and pupils were in general enthusiastic.

Some centers were successful in dividing the program in such a way that children could participate in both the tutorial and the enrichment parts of the program.

Many methods such as the use of achievement certificates, assembly awards, report cards, and membership cards were used to increase motivation. Library classes presented puppet shows, reading classes put on plays, music classes presented concerts, and art classes put on exhibits. These programs were presented for the benefit of both the centers and the communities.

Teachers would have liked better communication between the After School Center and the day school. It would have been beneficial to both the ASSC and the day school teachers to have exchanged reports on the pupils.

Outisde of citywide tests and teacher-made tests, no diagnostic testing was conducted. One of the objectives of the enrichment part of the program was the identification of talent. This would imply some evaluation of this area.

Some schools were observed serving snacks. The practice seemed to be worthwhile and should be considered as a future possibility for all centers.

A basic handbook should be prepared to inform nonpublic school personnel and the community about the offerings, procedures, and objectives of the after school centers.

The newsletter (Appendix A) prepared by the project coordinators was an important vehicle for morale building, exchange of ideas, and the dissemination of information. It should be continued.

The children studied in the sample did not overcome their deficiency in reading but many did succeed in reducing the extent of their retardation during the six-month period between the September 1966 and April 1967 citywide tests. During this period, children in grade two gained ten months in reading, third graders gained nine months, fourth graders gained seven months, fifth graders gained eight months, and sixth graders gained seven months.

The project coordinators and field supervisors engaged in continuous self-evaluation throughout the project. Thus, many of the recommendations of the report actually came from the supervisors and teachers as well as from the observation teams.

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street, New York

Title I Evaluations

GENERAL RESEARCH PROSPECTUS FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE MUSIC AND ART TITLE I EVALUATION.

The emphasis of this evaluation will be to determine what benefits the parochial schools are receiving from these particular programs, the specific objectives of the programs, and the manner in which these objectives are being implemented and achieved.

AREAS IN WHICH DATA WILL BE GATHERED:

I. Physical situation and limitations
  A. Scheduling - number of meetings and time allotted
  B. Number of students
  C. Manner of grouping
  D. Facilities
    1. room size and arrangement
    2. availability of piano, classroom phonograph, etc.
  E. Materials
    1. Quantity
    2. Suitability
    3. Quality

II. Personnel
  A. Staff - background, duties and responsibilities, relationships and means of communication.
    1. Administrators
    2. Supervisors
    3. Liaisons
    4. Teachers
  B. Students
    1. Age
    2. Sex
    3. Ethnic groups
    4. Denominational background
    5. Voluntary involvement
    6. Attendance

III. Objectives
  A. General Objectives of the Program
  B. Instructional Objectives (These will be grouped into the three specific areas of learning: cognitive, affective, and psychomotor.)
  Criteria for evaluating the objectives:
    1. Have any instructional objectives been stated?
    2. How were these objectives formulated - administration, teacher, or students-teacher?

3. Are the objectives stated in terms of overt behavior?
4. Are all levels of learning included?
5. Are they consistent with the broad objectives of the program?
6. Are they realistic enough to be achieved?
7. Does the teacher utilize these objectives in his own evaluation?

IV. Content -- (Stated in terms of objectives) Three general areas:
- A. Music
    - 1. Skills
    - 2. Literature
    - 3. Concepts
        - a. Melody
        - b. Rhythm
        - c. Harmony
        - d. Form
        - e. Expression
        - f. Style
- B. Art
    - 1. Skills
    - 2. Literature - Art History, Aesthetics, Art Education
    - 3. Concepts
        - a. Two-Dimensional Art
            - 1. Line
            - 2. Shape
            - 3. Texture
            - 4. Rhythm
            - 5. Color
            - 6. Design
        - b. Three-Dimensional Art
            - 1. Object environment relationship
            - 2. 3-Dimensional form concepts
            - 3. Design
        - c. Form (two & three dimensional concepts)
        - d. Expression
        - e. Style

V. Experiences (Methods and Activities)
- A. Teacher Methods - Music
    - 1. Provides varied musical experiences for the group and individuals
    - 2. Lecture
    - 3. Discussion
    - 4. Problem solving
    - 5. Imaginative use of facilities and materials
    - 6. Encourages outside exploration
    - 7. Student-initiated activities
    - 8. Creative approach to content and materials
    - 9. Pace flexible to student interests and needs
    - 10. Logical sequence

B. Teacher Methods - Art
   1. Provides varied art experiences for the group and the individual
   2. Lecture
   3. Discussion
   4. Problem solving
   5. Imaginative use of facilities and materials
   6. Encourages outside exploration
   7. Student - indicated activities
   8. Creative approach to content and materials
   9. Pace flexible to student interests and needs
   10. Logical sequence
   11. Use of audio-visual aids

C. Student Activities - Music
   1. Listening
   2. Singing
   3. Playing
   4. Moving (Rhythm)
   5. Creating
   6. Reading
   7. Discussion
   8. Group activities
   9. Field Trips
   10. Literature
   11. Individual attention

D. Student Activities
   1. Drawing (pencil, pen, crayon)
   2. Painting (tempers, water color), mixed media
   3. Three dimensional art (clay, foam glass, metal, paper, salt block, wire, wood)
   4. Craft experience (cardboard, clay, cloth, metal, paper, plastics, need, textiles, wire, wood, yarn)
   5. Class discussion of art concepts, art history
   6. Use of group art activities (murals, decorations, exhibits of student work)
   7. Field trips (outdoor sketching, museum visits, etc.)
   8. Use of art books and magazines in classroom
   9. Individual attention

VI. Attitudes and Process of Organization

Use of interviews and questionnaires to obtain the views of all the people involved:

A. Legitimation

Do people involved feel it is a legitimate program?

B. Validation

Does the present operation validly achieve the legitimate aims of the program?

C. Organization and communication

D. Participation and involvement

E. Tangency (adequate mediation between the groups involved)

ASSC Newsletter

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF STATE & FEDERALLY-ASSISTED PROGRAMS
AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS
141 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201
Vol. 1 No.2
March 1967

CHEERS FOR P.S. 316 K

"ASSC 316K held an Open House March 1,1967. Parents from both the public and non-public school (St. Teresa of Avila) came for a special program. Mr. Al Schwartz, Human Relations Co-ordinator, District 17, spoke to the assembled parents and clergy. This was followed by refreshments in the faculty lunchroom. The highlight of the afternoon was a complete tour of both the tutorial and enrichment classrooms. The guests visited every aspect of the Study Center. Their appreciative comments on the program in general and 316 in particular were unanimous."

BOUQUETS FOR ASSC

261K "----Amando, a recent arrival would not talk to anyone in class. After attending a reading group for three weeks, he suddenly began to answer Mrs. B. Levy's questions and now participates fully there and in his daytime classes. The consensus is that the center program deserves the credit for this change." Aaron C. Pinta- Field Supervisor

42X distributed to its reading teachers two excellent brochures: "Suggested Activities for the Tutorial Program" by Mrs. Dorothy Gruber, District 9 Reading Consultant and "A Suggested Format for the ASSC Reading Lesson" by Miss Clarice Pohoriles, P.S, 42X Corrective Reading Teacher.

9K has a Future Teachers Club: Volunteer pupils from sixth grade are assigned to the reading and art teachers to assist individual pupils on a one-to-one basis under the guidance of the ASSC teacher.

FREE! "12 Steps to Reading Success" American Education Publications, 1250 Fairwood Ave., Columbus, Ohio 43216

PROUD MOMENTS

202K presented a program, "An Afternoon of Music," at a well-attended assembly of public and non-public school parents. Children played their song flutes and also accompanied a recording of classical music with rhythm instruments. Miss E. Weber and Mr. V. Stanton were responsible for this delight.

3K Shirley Maiman and Myron Goldberg, art teachers, arranged the following fine program: Slides of chilren's art work with a tape recording made by the children describing their works were shown to parents of public and non-public school children. Non-public school participation substantially increased as a result of this program.

199M "Flags and Banners" exhibition, March 14 through 21, was sparked by Karin Peters, art teacher, whose pupils used the felt supplied by the center.

9M travels to **75M** to meet for athletic events. Escort service for pupils is being arranged by Mr.S. Peltz, Field Supervisor in H. ED. for these centers.

DO YOU KNOW ...?

52Q recommends Teacher's Guide for Remedial Reading by W. Kottmeyer

ASSC suggests Puerto Ricans-Strangers then Neighbors by Clarence Senior

HAVE YOU TRIED...?

155K, to stimulate participation in the art program, displayed attractively the art media available to the children.

16K has many new arrivals from Latin American countries. Miss Sandra Kaplan uses games, puppets, telephones, piano, neighborhood walks and talks by prominent community figures to accelerate the children's learning of English.

Several ASSC have sent out dual language letters to parents acquainting them with the activities of the program...

130M mentions a tri-language flyer to the homes in its area.

9M suggests for greater publicity photos of children at work placed on Parents' Bulletin Board.

98M keeps a profile for each child so that progress can be noted. Before entering the program, the pupil is evaluated by teacher and supervisor.

* * * * *

1967-1968

Suggestions for ordering instructional materials and supplies are welcome now. Write to the specific coordinator.

* * * * *

We wish to thank all who have contributed to this issue. Once again we invite everyone to send in brief descriptions of "happenings" in your ASSC.

NOTES IN MUSIC

Field Supervisors of Music in the ASSC Program organized inspiring workshops for their teachers in different borough schools.

Field Supervisor	Music Class	ASSC Teacher
S. Hughes	Clarinet	65X M.Mellon
	Clarinet	37X J.Barr
	Chorus	49X E.Moore
D.Lawyer	Instrumental	83M C.Taylor
	Vocal and Song flute	128M C.Thompson
I.Parness	Rhythm and Melody	
B.Fishenfeld	Instruments	73K J.Green
M.Rosenberg	Song flute	73K J.LaMonica
A.Richter	(Arranged Teacher)	at 33M
A.Raphael	(Round-Tables)	at 58K

What a pleasant way of learning how to teach!

Our First Blush

The 2nd Grade magazine "The Night Before Christmas"was inadvertently credited to the wrong school. It is Miss M. Farley of 132K who deserves the bouquet.

FLASH!

National Library Week
April 16 - April 22
Themes
Explore Inner Space - READ
READING is what's HAPPENING!

Suggested Activities for April 16-22

1. Have the students of the ASSC program select the book or books they have enjoyed reading. A second list might include books that have been read aloud.
2. Share these lists with the ASSC program in your school,with the day school and with the library coordinator..

* * * * *

At this time we wish to extend best wishes for a HAPPY SPRING HOLIDAY to all who have participated in the ASSC program.

"The Coordinators"

Appendix B - INSTRUMENTS

AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS

List of Instruments

Checklist B1

Evaluation Report B9

Art Evaluation Team B16

Nature and Quality of Student's Classroom Experience B23

After School Study Center Art Program B32

Health Education Evaluation Instrument B37

Survey of Title I--S.P.D.S. Health Education Programs B45

After School Study Center Tutorial Program Work Sheet B49

After School Study Center Tutorial Program Classroom Observation B50

Supervisory Practices B51

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street, New York

Title I Evaluations

MUSIC OBSERVATION CHECKLIST
INSTRUCTIONS TO OBSERVERS

Purposes of the Checklist:

1. As a guide in carrying out research;
2. To remind evaluator of procedures which might otherwise be overlooked; and
3. As a convenient means of checking the progress of an investigation.

The checklist should be marked in accordance with the following definitions:

1. If the provision or condition is very limited;
2. If the provision or condition is made to some extent;
3. If the provision or condition is made extensively;
4. If the provision or condition is missing and needed; and
5. If the provision or condition is not desirable or does not apply.

I. CONTENT

1. An aural song repertoire is provided which includes material that meets the growing needs, interests, and abilities of pupils.

2. Varied singing activities are provided, which include folk and art songs.

3. Opportunities are provided for all pupils to participate in well-planned singing activities at assemblies and special programs.

4. A glee club or choir provides for pupils with special talent or interest.

5. Activities are provided for reading from the musical score and for unison singing at the early elementary levels.

6. At the advanced elementary levels, pupils participate in a variety of part singing activities.

7. Music theory experiences in grades 4-6 include instruction concerning musical symbols.

8. Opportunities are provided for a variety of rhythmic experiences.

9. Opportunities are provided for the use of rhythm instruments.

10. Opportunities are provided for participation in an instrumental ensemble.

11. Opportunities are provided for experiences with a variety of simple melody instruments (e.g. autoharp, xylophone, bells, flutophone, and recorder).

12. Opportunities are provided for pupils with special talent to utilize their ability for classroom and community programs.

13. Opportunities are provided for pupil attendance at community music events.

14. Listening experiences permeate the total program.

15. A variety of creative experiences are provided in which the pupils may express originality or initiative.

16. Opportunities are provided throughout for the development of the musicianship of each child to its potential capacity.

17. Opportunities are provided throughout all music activities for growth in appreciation of the great works of music.

18. Opportunities are given for children to create their own melodies.

19. Opportunities are provided to develop understanding of form______________; harmony______________; and style______________.

MUSIC OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

EVALUATIONS

1. How extensive is the variety of music activities in meeting the music needs of all pupils?
2. How adequate is the content of music activities in meeting the music needs of all pupils?
3. How adequate is the level of performance of the pupils?
4. How adequate is the planning?

COMMENTS:

MUSIC OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

II. METHODS

1. The controlling idea underlying the entire program is the development of musicianship and musical responsiveness.
2. Instructional objectives are stated in terms of the students' observable behavior.
3. Instructional activities are planned to achieve the stated objectives.
4. The objectives are realistic enough to be achieved.
5. Musical content is structured.
6. Problems are analyzed and help is provided.
7. Activities are derived from the music.
8. Effective use is made of the piano.
9. Efforts are made to inform parents and community of the objectives and accomplishments of the school music program.
10. Instructional activities are related to the pupils' environment.
11. Instructional activities provide for a balance between individual and group activities.
12. Pupils are given opportunities to plan, conduct, and evaluate their music activities.
13. Effective methods of teaching are utilized.
14. The program utilizes the musical resources of the community.

EVALUATIONS

1. How effectively do the methods of instruction meet the group music needs of pupils?
2. How effectively do the methods of instruction meet the particular music needs of individual pupils?
3. To what extent do evaluation procedures help the particular music needs of individual pupils?

COMMENTS

III. ROOM EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES

1. Sets of school song books which are current have representative selections of a high caliber and are available.

2. Teachers' Manuals are available.

3. Books containing material on music history, composers, instruments, and stories are available.

4. Professional books in music instruction are available for teachers.

5. Equipment necessary for music activities is provided.
Piano______ Pitchpipe________ Staff-liner________ Music charts________

6. Rhythm band instruments are provided.
Drums_________Rhythm sticks_______Jinglesticks________Sand blocks__________
Wood blocks__________Castanets______ Cymbals________Triangles_____Gongs______
Gourds_________ Rattles___Maracas____Guiro____Tambourines____Claves___

7. Simple melody instruments are provided.
Flutophone____Recorder______Tonette_________Autoharp________Melody Bells_____
Resonator bells_________ Step bells_________Ukelele__________

8. Orchestra and band instruments are available.
List___________________________________

9. Materials for constructing simple rhythm band instruments are available.

10. Music stands [illegible] provided.

11. A radio and television are available.

12. A phonograph which plays at all speeds.

13. A tape recorder is available.

14. Some of the basic record libraries are available with the teachers' guides.

15. Adequate storage facilities are available.

16. Duplicating equipment is available.

MUSIC OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

III. Room Equipment and Supplies (continued)

EVALUATIONS

1. How extensive is the variety of instructional equipment and materials to meet the music needs of all pupils?
2. How adequate is the quality of instructional equipment and materials to meet the music needs of all pupils?
3. How effectively are instructional equipment and supplies used?

COMMENTS

IV. OUTCOMES

1. To what extent are pupils developing effective singing skills?
2. To what extent are pupils developing desirable musical taste?
3. To what extent are pupils developing instrumental knowledges and skills?
4. To what extent are pupils developing self-expression through music?
5. To what extent are pupils developing knowledges and skills in music theory?
6. To what extent are pupils applying their ability in out-of-school music activities?
7. To what extent are music activities making effective contributions to the total school program?
8. To what extent are musical habits being developed?
9. To what extent are talented or gifted students identified through the use of standardized tests?
10. To what extent do the students value the music program?
11. To what extent are pupils able to comprehend, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate their musical learnings?
12. To what extent does the music program have a desirable impact upon and promote constructive relationships with community agencies?
13. To what extent is provision made for continuing and constructive evaluation of all facets of the program?

COMMENTS

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street, N.Y.C.

Title I Evaluations

MUSIC OBSERVATION SUMMARY SCALES

Name of School____________________ Borough__________ Date______________

Address____ Phone________________

Teacher________________________ Grade(s)____________________

Observer________________________ Time____________________

No. of Pupils____________________ Age Range____________________

Method of Grouping____

No. of Meetings per Week________________ Length of Meetings______________

SUMMARY SCALES

GENERAL

	0	1	2	3	OPTIMUM
Content					
Methods					
Facilities					
Motivation					
Realization of General Objectives					
Instructional Objectives					
	0	1	2	3	OPTIMUM

MUSIC

	0	1	2	3	OPTIMUM
Listening					
Singing					
Playing					
Rhythm					
Creating					
Reading					
	0	1	2	3	OPTIMUM

Evaluation Report---Title I Art Enrichment Program for Disadvantaged Children---New York City Elementary Schools---Winter, 1966-7

Name of School ______________________________
Location __________________________________
Day of Visit _______________________________
Name of Evaluator ____________________________

SUMMARY GRAPH

	0	1	2	3	4	5
A. School location and description						
B. Classroom & Facilities						
C. Art Supplies and Equipment						
D. Administration and Supervision						
E. Instructional Quality and Techniques						
I. Teachers						
II. Methods						
F. Art Experiences & Activities						
G. Students						
I. Composition						
II. Involvement						
H. Interviews						
I. Assessment of Program						

II. Recommendations

see written comment below

J. SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVALUATORS

A. School Location & Description	0	1	2	3	4	5
1. Neighborhood:	0	1	2	3	4	5
2. Building Exterior & Grounds:	0	1	2	3	4	5
3. Interior:	0	1	2	3	4	5
B. Classroom & Facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
4. Gen'l. Appearance & Size:	0	1	2	3	4	5
5. Storage Area, Supplies & Student Work:	0	1	2	3	4	5
6. Exhibition Space; Facilities:	0	1	2	3	4	5
7. Sinks, etc.:	0	1	2	3	4	5
8. Windows & Lighting:	0	1	2	3	4	5
9. Furniture:	0	1	2	3	4	5
10. Layout:	0	1	2	3	4	5
11. Others:	0	1	2	3	4	5

C. Art supplies & Equipment	0 1 2 3 4 5
12. Materials Used in Specific Activities:	0 1 2 3 4 5
13. Variety (General):	0 1 2 3 4 5
14. Quantity:	0 1 2 3 4 5
15. Quality & Suitability:	0 1 2 3 4 5
16. Availability:	0 1 2 3 4 5
17. Organization & Distribution:	0 1 2 3 4 5
18. Others:	0 1 2 3 4 5
D. Administration & Supervision	0 1 2 3 4 5
19. Cooperation & Support:	0 1 2 3 4 5
20. Liaison:	0 1 2 3 4 5
21. General Attitudes:	0 1 2 3 4 5
22. Others:	0 1 2 3 4 5

E. Instructional Quality & Techniques / / / / / /
0 1 2 3 4 5

I. Teachers / / / / / /
0 1 2 3 4 5

23. Background & Experience: / / / / / /
0 1 2 3 4 5

24. Orientation to Goals of Program: / / / / / /
0 1 2 3 4 5

25. Attitudes: / / / / / /
0 1 2 3 4 5

26. Others: / / / / / /
0 1 2 3 4 5

II. Methods / / / / / /
0 1 2 3 4 5

27. Presentation of Material: / / / / / /
0 1 2 3 4 5

28. Student Motivation: / / / / / /
0 1 2 3 4 5

29. Group Discussion & Involvement: / / / / / /
0 1 2 3 4 5

30. Introduction of Art Principles & Concepts: / / / / / /
0 1 2 3 4 5

31. Problem Solving: / / / / / /
0 1 2 3 4 5

32. Imaginative Use of Facilities & Materials: / / / / / /
0 1 2 3 4 5

33. Encouragement of Individual, Outside Exploration: / / / / / /
0 1 2 3 4 5

34. Student-Indicated Activities: 0 1 2 3 4 5

35. Flexible Pace---Responsive to Student Interests & Needs: 0 1 2 3 4 5

36. Logical Sequence: 0 1 2 3 4 5

37. Use of Audio-Visual Aids: 0 1 2 3 4 5

38. Organization & Exhibition of Student Work: 0 1 2 3 4 5

39. Others: 0 1 2 3 4 5

F. Art Experiences & Activities 0 1 2 3 4 5

40. Diversity of Materials & Media: 0 1 2 3 4 5

41. Art Concepts & History: 0 1 2 3 4 5

42. Group Art Activities (Murals, Decorations, Etc.): 0 1 2 3 4 5

43. Field Trips, Etc.: 0 1 2 3 4 5

44. Art Books & Magazines in Classroom: 0 1 2 3 4 5

45. Individual Attention; Problems: 0 1 2 3 4 5

G. Students

0 1 2 3 4 5

I. Composition

0 1 2 3 4 5

47. By Age: 0 1 2 3 4 5

48. By Gender: 0 1 2 3 4 5

49. By Ethnic Grouping: 0 1 2 3 4 5

50. Non-Public School Children Participating: 0 1 2 3 4 5

51. Academic Levels & Proportions: 0 1 2 3 4 5

52. Others: 0 1 2 3 4 5

II. Involvement

0 1 2 3 4 5

53. Attendance Patterns: 0 1 2 3 4 5

54. Observed Attitudes: 0 1 2 3 4 5

55. Expressed Attitudes: 0 1 2 3 4 5

56. Classroom Behavior: 0 1 2 3 4 5

57. Degree of Participation: 0 1 2 3 4 5

58. Others: 0 1 2 3 4 5

H. Interviews	0 1 2 3 4 5
I. Assessment of Program	0 1 2 3 4 5
59. Teachers:	0 1 2 3 4 5
60. Administrators:	0 1 2 3 4 5
61. Others:	0 1 2 3 4 5
II. Recommendations	0 1 2 3 4 5
62. Teachers:	0 1 2 3 4 5
63. Administrators:	0 1 2 3 4 5
64. Others:	0 1 2 3 4 5

J. Summary Statements:

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE ART PROGRAM: (GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS)

___ 1. The objectives include behavior in the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains.

___ 2. The objectives include complex learning.

___ 3. The objectives include simple learning.

___ 4. The objectives are stated in terms of overt behavior.

___ 5. The objectives are consistent with the program objectives.

___ 6. The objectives are realistic enough to be achieved.

___ 7. The objectives serve as a criteria for the teacher's evaluation.

___ 8. The objectives are formulated cooperatively by the pupils, teachers, parents and administrators.

___ 9. The objectives are written and in the hands of teachers, administrators and parents.

RELATIONSHIP OF METHODS OF INSTRUCTION TO AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE ART PROGRAM

___22. To what extent is there evidence of careful planning and preparation of learning activities in relation to stated objectives?

___23. To what extent have the objectives of the art program been explained to the students?

___24. To what extent do the objectives of the art program condition the methods of evaluation used by the art teacher?

___25. To what extent have the students participated in the planning of objectives?

___26. To what extent are the objectives re-examined and revised by the teacher and the students?

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE ART PROGRAM:

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE RELATIONSHIP OF METHODS OF INSTRUCTION TO THE FULFILLMENT OF AIMS AND OBJECTIVES:

THE NATURE OF THE LEARNING ACTIVITY

___1. The activity provides for instruction in basic techniques of manipulation of materials, media and tools.

___2. The activity provides for the development of art quality in design.

___3. Each student does his own work which is clearly different from that of the other students.

___4. The activity provides for the student to discover the emotional significance art has in his life.

___5. The activity provides for the opportunity of students to relate their experiences to those of local and regional artists and designers for aesthetic and vocational purposes.

___6. The activity provides the opportunity for students to talk about art and to make judgements about their own art expressions and the art in their environment.

___7. The activity provides for aesthetic self-expression in terms of services for other people, the school, the home, and the community.

___8. Students assist in planning, conducting, and evaluating their art experiences.

___9. Use is made of slides, films, filmstrips, reproductions, and other visual aids.

TYPE OF LEARNING ACTIVITY

___10. Drawing and painting activities involve the use of (check):

____chalk
____charcoal
____crayon
____ink
____wash
____pencil
____Poster paint
____water color
____oil paint
____mixed media

___11. Three-dimensional design involves the use of (check):

____cement
____clay
____firebrick
____foam glass
____metal
____paper
____paste
____salt blocks
____stone
____wire
____wood
Other ______________________________

___12. Crafts involve the use of (check):

____cardboard
____clay
____cloth
____metal
____paper
____plastics
____reed
____textiles
____wire
____wood
____yarns
Other

____ 13. Graphic arts include opportunities for (check)
____bulletin board arrangements
____etching
____linoleum block cutting and printing
____photography
____silk screen printing
____simple lithography
____stenciling
____woodcut carving and printing

____ 14. The activity provides for the study of our art heritage.

____ 15. The activity provides for the development of appreciations for contemporary machine and handmade objects, sculpture, and painting.

Other descriptive information: ______________________________

____

____

____

____

THE QUALITY OF THE LEARNING ACTIVITY (EVALUATION)

____ 16. To what extent has this learning activity encouraged students to discover, explore, express, and appraise?

____

____

____

____ 17. To what extent has instruction been provided for in the use of a variety of art media?

____

____

____

____ 18. To what extent has this learing activity been adapted to individual interests and abilities of the students?

____

____

____

THE QUALITY OF THE LEARNING ACTIVITY IN RELATION TO TEACHER PERFORMANCE

(Based on Guide Prepared by Dr. Ruth E. Hartley)

__19. The teacher shows evidence of enjoyment in his relationships with students.

____

__20. The teacher is responsive in a constructive way to the emotional needs of individuals.

____

__21. The teacher looks for and uses opportunities to communicate verbally and otherwise with individual students at appropriate times.

____

__22. The teacher maintains standards of group behavior that encourage optimal levels of learning.

____

__23. The teacher helps students develop healthy inner controls of behavior in a group situation.

____

__24. The teacher maintains materials and equipment in an attractive manner.

____

__25. The teacher shows evidence of having collected and developed resource materials for use in class.

____

__26. The teacher reveals evidence of planning for pupil activities.

____

__27. The teacher plans for a number of activities or different levels of work to be going on in the room at the same time.

____

__28. The teacher gives explanations and directions in clear and easily understood form.

____

__29. The teacher provides his students with the opportunity for enough practice to develop basic skills in the manipulation of tools and materials of the art process.

____30. The teacher selects experiences with and for his students which provide active involvement in first hand experiences.

____31. The teacher brings a variety of sensory experiences to bear on learning situations.

____32. The teacher helps students to discover relationships and make generalizations.

____33. The teacher spaces new learnings effectively; permits assimilations of a concept before moving on to a new one.

____34. The teacher helps students apply generalizations to new situations; encourages exploration beyond classroom group presentation.

____35. The teacher uses interests and concerns of individuals to encourage them to explore new areas of knowledge (or art processes) and develop new concepts.

____36 The teacher involves students in continuous evaluation of progress toward goals.

____THE NATURE OF THE SETTING FOR THE LEARNING ACTIVITY

(THE PHYSICAL FACILITIES)

____37. The art room has been located so that students may see art that is currently in process.

____38 The room has been planned to encourage individual and group work.

____39. The room has been planned to facilitate a wide range of creative activities.

____40. Storage space for student work in progress is easily accessible.

____ 41. Provision has been made for storage and work space for (check):

____drawing and painting

____modeling and carving

____weaving and construction

____printing and arranging

Comments:____

____

____ 42. Walk-in storage closet for materials and supplies adjoins the workroom.

____43. Appropriate motorized tools are provided.

____44. Workbenches are provided

____45. Electrical and gas outlets are provided for (check):

____pottery kiln

____enameling oven

____electrical tools

____gas tanks and torches

____audio-visual equipment

46. The wall surfaces permit use for display.

____47. Installalton and equipment are provided for use of audio-visual materials.

____48. Work tables are provided so that students may have sufficient space to work (6 to 9 square feet).

____49. Storage for materials and tools currently in use is organized so students can get and return them quickly.

THE QUALITY OF THE SETTING (EVALUATION)

____ 50. To what extent is the space adequate for a variety of creative activities?

____

____

____51. To what extent do the facilities of the art room make provisions for a wide variety of creative activities?

____

____

____52. To what extent is equipment kept in good repair?

____

____ 53. To what extent is storage for supplies adequate?

____

____

____ 54. To what extent is storage for student's work in progress ample?

____

____

____ 55. How adequate are the lighting facilities?

____

____

NATURE OF THE MATERIALS INVOLVED IN THE LEARNING ACTIVITY

____ 56. Materials and tools are provided for students for the following activities (check):

____to paint with tempera, oil, watercolors.
____to sketch with chalk, conte crayon and charcoal.
____to model with clay, paper mache.
____to carve in wood, plastic, salt block, stone.
____to construct arrangements and objects with cardboard, fabrics, fibers, metal, paper, wire, wood.
____to print with linoleum, wood, silk screen.
____to weave with a variety of fibers.
____to arrange displays of student work and other two- and three-dimensional art.
Other ______________________________
____

____ 57. A variety of reference books is provided.

____ 58. Art magazines are available for use.

____ 59. Provision is made to have readily available such materials as (check):
____ films
____filmstrips
____slides
____ loan exhibitions

THE QUALITY OF THE MATERIALS INVOLVED (EVALUATION)

____ 60. How adequate is the variety of materials and tools for instruction?

____

____ 61. How adequate is the quality of materials for instruction?

____

____

____ 62. To what extent has the selection of tools and materials been aprropriate to the learning activity?

____

____

____ 63. How effectively are materials organized for use?

____

____

____ 64. To what extent are tools and equipment kept in good working order?

____

____

METHODS OF EVALUATION USED BY THE TEACHER (THE NATURE OF)

____ 65. Records are kept of reaction of students to various art experiences.

____ 66. Teacher and students establish criteria for evaluation of art products, after each student evaluates his own work.

____ 67. Students make and keep their own progress reports.

____ 68. Evaluation is made of the student's ability to select and choose products of functional design.

____ 69. Evaluation is based on the student's increasing skill in designing in a variety of media.

____ 70. Teacher and students study work of students to reveal strengths and point areas for improvement.

THE QUALITY OF METHODS OF EVALUATION (EVALUATION)

____ 71. How well do evaluation procedures help students to understand the nature of their progress?

____

____

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE NATURE OF THE LEARNING ACTIVITY:

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE NATURE OF THE PHYSICAL FACILITIES:

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE MATERIALS OF INSTRUCTION:

____72. To what extent do evaluation procedures identify students of unusual promise in the field of art?

____

____

____73. How well do students evaluate their own work and the work of others?

____

____

Additional Comments of Evaluation:

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 WEST 42nd STREET
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036

Title I Evaluations

AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTER ART PROGRAM

DIRECTIONS:

1. Please read all questions carefully and give us as accurate answers as possible.
   Write in margins or on the back of the page if more space is required.
2. Where opinions are solicited, be frank. Individuals will not be identified in the report.
3. Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope as soon as possible to:

   Stewart Kranz,
   Center for Urban Education
   33 West 42nd Street
   New York, N.Y. 10036

4. Through your cooperation we can hope to have an even more effective program in the following years.

Thank you for your help.

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 WEST 42nd STREET
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036

Title I Evaluations

I. General Information:

1. Name (optional)

2. Do you teach art in the after school study center? yes________ no ________

3. Do you also teach art in the New York City public day school program? yes________ no ________ other________

4. If you answered yes to question 3, do you teach both programs in the same school? same school________ diff.school________

5. Days offered (circle proper ones) Tues. Wed. Thurs.

6. School where located (optional)
   Name____________________
   Address____________________

7. Non Public Schools served (optional)
   Name____________________
   Address____________________

   Name____________________
   Address____________________

II. Please tell us about yourself:

8. Sex ________male ________female

9. License ________regular ________Substitute

10. Position ________full time ________part time

11. Years of teaching experience ____________

12. Level of experience____________Elementary; ____________Secondary; ____________System Wide.

13. Subject taught ________________________

14. Briefly list your background, experience and specialized education (if any) in art.____

____

III. Please tell us about your program:

15. What was the average attendance in your class during the following periods of time:

	Non-Pub.Students	Public School
October- November		
December-February		
March to Present		

16. If you taught art in previous Title I programs (Spring 1966, Summer 1966), how would you compare ratios of attendance between these programs? (Estimate if no exact figures are available.)

	% Non-Pub.School	% Pub.School
Spring 1966		
Summer 1966		
Current		

17. Grades served by the program____

18. Age range____

19. Equipment:
    1. __________Very adequate
    2. __________Adequate
    3. __________Less than adequate

20. What materials, books and equipment have you not been able to obtain?

21. What materials, books and equipment did you yourself bring, construct, or borrow?

22. Do you believe the content of the program is beneficial to disadvantaged children?
    1. __________yes
    2. __________no

23. Do you believe that the composition of your classes is made up chiefly of disadvantaged children?

1. ________yes
2. ________no

24. What is your estimate of the % of disadvantaged?________________

IV. Please place an -X- at the proper position on the scales below:

25.

3	2	1
Students are highly motivated and enter into the activities enthusiastically.	Students are somewhat interested. Some participate, others do not.	Students are not interested and do not participate

26.

3	2	1
The classroom is attractive. Other facilities are in excellent condition.	The classroom is adequate, but unattractive. Some equipment is damaged.	The classroom is small and poorly equipped. The lessons are hindered by inadequate equipment.

27. Do you find that children in your classes work better in a permissive, partially structured, or highly structured classroom environment?
Please Comment:

28. Do the classroom and facilities suit the age range of the children?

1. ________yes
2. ________no

29. Did the classroom offer adequate exhibition area and secure storage space for materials and student projects? Comment:

V. What types of project have you found to be particularly successful in motivating and involving the disadvantaged child?

VI. Please comment on your reactions to teaching the disadvantaged children involved in your after-school program. (Special problems, gratifications, etc.)

VII. Are there any activities or outcomes of the program which you would like to share with other art teachers? Is there any special advice you would offer to guide teachers of similar programs in the future?

VIII. What are your general comments and recommendations for next year's program?

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street, N. Y. C.

Title I Evaluations

HEALTH EDUCATION EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

EDUCATIONAL ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

School______________ Borough______________ Date________

Address______________________________

Days per week__________ Days per child______________

	Registration	Daily Average	Age	Grade
Boys				
Girls				
Total				

Method of determining attendance:______________________

Requirements for enrollment:

Parent Consent______________
Health examination______________
Health card______________
Other______________

Medical assistance is available in case of injury through:

School nurse__________
Outside aid__________
Other__________

Student records include:

Name______________
Address______________
Phone______________
Parents' Name and Address__________
Other______________________

PROGRAM

Objectives

Written statement of objectives:

Board of Education________

School____________________

Comment:____

____

Content organization written:

Board of Education________________

School____________________________

Comment:____

____

Supervision

Supervision through:

Orientation meetings___________________________
Program planning_______________________________.
Instructional Evaluation by supervisor_________

Offerings

Key: H - recreational
I - instructional
C - competition

Activity	Boys	Girls
Dance		
Exercise		
Team sports and games		
Individual/dual sports and games		
Special events		

Time devoted to instruction: ____________________mins.

Evidence of grouping of students for instruction:

Grade level______________

Fitness level____________

Skill level______________

Student interest__________

Facilities_______________

Nature of activities_________

The size of instructional groups is such as to permit effective teaching, taking into account personnel, facilities, and the nature of activities.__________

Non-instructional groups (specify:____________________________________) receive adequate supervision.____________

Testing

Program in:

Physical fitness__________
Sport and Game___________
Other____________________
Records maintained________

Staff

Sex: (M) (F)

Educational background

	1	2	3	4
Degree				
Major field				
Teaching field				

Other related experiences and competencies:______________________________

____

____

____

Staff (continued)

	1	2	3	4
Other Responsibilities				
Teaching (full or part-time)	____	____	____	____
Student	____	____	____	____

Facilities

Facility	Number Used	Condition
Indoor gymnasium	______	______
Outdoor areas	______	______
Classrooms	______	______
Game Rooms	______	______
Bathrooms	______	______
Locker rooms	______	______
Shower rooms	______	______
Offices	______	______
Medical room	______	______
Other:		
______________________	______	______
______________________	______	______
______________________	______	______

Comments regarding lay-out and features such as flooring, lighting, obstructions, safety hazards, and accessibility:____

____

____

Equipment

Proper protective equipment is provided for all students engaging in physical education activities:____________.

Proper uniform, including sneakers, is required for all students:______________.

HEALTH EDUCATION EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

Equipment used	Number used	Condition
1.____________________	______	______
2.____________________	______	______
3.____________________	______	______
4.____________________	______	______
5.____________________	______	______
6.____________________	______	______
7.____________________	______	______
8.____________________	______	______
9.____________________	______	______
10.___________________	______	______

General comment on equipment____

____

____

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street, N. Y. C.

Title I Evaluations

CHECKLIST FOR EVALUATION IN THE CONDUCT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

School________________________ Borough________________________

Activity________________________ Students: No.____ Ages_____ Sex_____

The Teacher

Voice - Clear and easily heard ( )
too loud ( )
too soft ( )

Manner - enthusiastic ( )
smiling ( )
timid ( )
impatient ( )
lifeless ( )

Dress - appropriate))

General teaching competence:______________________________________

____

____

General Presentation

Materials ready ( ) marks on floor ( )
Orderly way of getting pupils into formation ( )
Stands where all can see ( )
Effective classification for teaching ( )
Clear, concise explanation ( )
Uses demonstration effectively ( )
Gets underway quickly ( )
Utilizes space effectively ( )
Appropriate activity for specific group ( )

Conducting Activity

Sees errors ( ) makes corrections and suggestions ( )
Attempts to develop skills ( )
Attempts to establish desirable social behavior ( )
Makes individual comments( )
Maximum involvement for each student( )
Keeps things going ( )
Adds modifications when necessary ( )

CHECKLIST FOR EVALUATION IN THE CONDUCT
OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

Pupil Response

Attentive (   )
Restless (   )
Responsive to suggestions (   )
Enjoyment (   )
Activity (   )

Comments____

____

____

____

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street, N. Y. C.

EVALUATION OF LIBRARY SERVICES NEEDED IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Title I Evaluations

(Please check all Items that apply and star items in which you spent the major portion of your time.)

	Serviced	Needs To Be Serviced
Organization of the Library		
Needed Books		
Started on Shelf List		
Started on Card Catalog		
Grouped Books		
Classified Books		
Catalogued Books		
Processed Books		
Worked on Inventory		
Work With Children		
Library Skill Lessons		
Circulation		
Storytelling		
Book Talks		
Reference Skills		
Work with Teachers		
Planned for Library Organization		
Planned for Book Selection		
Helped with Book Order		
Held Teacher-Librarian Conferences		
Other Activities		

SURVEY OF
TITLE I--S.P.D.S. HEALTH EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Directions

Please answer all of the questions on this survey form. Most of the questions can be answered by placing a check (√) next to the appropriate response. In cases where the answer to a question is not known please write "unknown".

1. Name of teacher filling out this survey form (please print) ______________________________

2. School name or number (i.e., the Title I After School Study Center at which you work) ______________________________

3. How many teachers are working in the health education program?* ____________

*(All references to the "health education program" or "the program", or "your program" refer to the Special Potential Development Services after-school program in health education for disadvantaged pupils at the school named in item 2 above.)

4. Please indicate the type(s) of teaching license(s) you hold (include subject specialization and school level): ______________________________
____
____

5. Please indicate the type(s) of teaching licence(s) held by the other teachers working in the health education program (include subject specialization and school level:
Teacher #2: ______________________________
____
Teacher #3: ______________________________
____

6. Do you have a record of the pupils assigned to the health education program?
yes ( ) no ( )

7. Is a daily record of student attendance taken for each session? yes ( ) no ( )

8. (a) Is a "Medical Consent Form" on file for each of the pupils in the program?
yes ( ) no ( )

(b) If "no", approximately what percentage of the pupils have such forms on file?
0 to 25% ( ); 26 to 50% ( ); 51 to 75% ( ); 76 to 100% ( )

9. How many pupils are registered in the program? Boys __________ Girls __________

10. How many of the registered pupils are from public schools? ____________
non-public schools? ____________

11. How are pupils scheduled to attend sessions?
-all pupils attend all sessions ( )
-some sessions are limited to boys or girls ( )
-some sessions are limited to pupils in upper or lower grades ( )
other, specify ______________________________
____

12. Have provisions been made for obtaining medical assistance in case of an emergency? yes ( ) no ( )

13. (a) Has the supervisor of the health education program visited your school? yes ( ) no ( )
    (b) If "yes", how many times? ____________
    (c) Has the supervisor assisted you with program planning? yes ( ) no ( ) teaching methods? yes ( ) no ( ), administrative problems? yes ( ) no ( ) Has he assisted you in other ways? (specify)________________________
    ____

THE PROGRAM

14. Has a written plan of activities for the health education program at your school been developed? yes ( ) no ( )

15. Have you used the bulletin "Physical Activities for the Elementary Schools" as a guide in planning and conducting the program? yes ( ) no ( )

16. Are pupils homogeneously grouped for instructional purposes? yes ( ) no ( ) If so, on what bases? grade level ( ) fitness level ( ) skill level ( ) student interest ( ) other ________________________

17. What portion of the total program is devoted to instruction? 0 to 25% ( ); 26 to 50% ( ); 51 to 75% ( ); 76 to 100% ( )

18. What portion of the total program is recreational in nature? 0 to 25% ( ); 26 to 50% ( ); 51 to 75% ( ); 76 to 100% ( )

19. Which of the following most closely approximates the teacher/pupil ratio during normal instructional periods? 1 to 10 ( ); 1 to 15 ( ); 1 to 20 ( ); 1 to 30 ( ); 1 to 40 ( ); 1 to 50 or more ( )

20. What part of the activity program is conducted on a coeducational basis? less than 10% ( ); 10% to 30% ( ); 31% to 50% ( ); 51% to 70% ( ); 71% to 90% ( ); 91 to 100% ( ).

21. (a) Was the President's Council physical fitness screening test administered to your pupils? yes ( ) no ( )
    (b) Was any other fitness test used? yes ( ) no ( ) Which one?____________
    (c) How many pupils have been tested? ____________
    (d) How many pupils failed the test? ____________
    (e) Have pupils who failed the test been required to participate in a regular program of progressive developmental exercises? yes ( ) no ( )
    (f) Have pupils who failed the test been retested? yes ( ) no ( )
    (g) How many pupils passed the retest? ____________

22. (a) Do all students spend at least 15 minutes per day in sustained conditioning exercises and developmental activities? yes ( ) no ( )
    (b) Do all students (as a group) perform the same exercises at the same time? yes ( ) no ( )
    (c) Are individualized exercise programs provided for the underdeveloped child? yes ( ) no ( )

23. Are any tests or other forms of systematic evaluation (not including fitness tests) used to assess pupil progress? yes ( ) no ( )

24. (a) Which of the following activities are a regular part of the health education program? (please check (✓))

(b) Which of the following groups participate in the activity? (please check (✓)

(c) Does a teacher provide regular instruction in the activity? (pls.check(✓))

	(a)	Boys	Girls	Yes	No
(1) Team sports:					
volley ball	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
basketball	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
softball	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
football (touch)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
soccer	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
other (specify)		( )	( )	( )	( )
		( )	( )	( )	( )
		( )	( )	( )	( )
(2) Individual and dual sports:					
track and field	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
stunts and tumbling	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
gymnastics	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
handball	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
other (specify)		( )	( )	( )	( )
		( )	( )	( )	( )
		( )	( )	( )	( )
		( )	( )	( )	( )
(3) Games of low organization:					
relays	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
lead up games	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
other (specify)		( )	( )	( )	( )
		( )	( )	( )	( )
		( )	( )	( )	( )
(4) Dance:					
folk	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
square	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
social	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
modern	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
creative	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
other (specify)		( )	( )	( )	( )
		( )	( )	( )	( )
		( )	( )	( )	( )
(5) Fundamental movement activities and/or expressive movement patterns:	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
(6) Self-testing activities:	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
(7) Creative activities:	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
(8) Song plays:	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
(9) Practice of basic sports skills	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
(10) Other activities (specify)		( )	( )	( )	( )
		( )	( )	( )	( )
		( )	( )	( )	( )
		( )	( )	( )	( )

FACILITIES

25. Which of the following facilities are available for the health education program? (please check (✓))

Indoor gymnasium ( )
Outdoor play area ( )
Classroom(s) ( )
Game room(s) ( )
Bathrooms ( )
Locker rooms ( )
Shower rooms ( )
Teacher's office ( )
Medical room ( )
Other ____________

____
____
____
____
____
____
____
____
____

EQUIPMENT

26. How many pieces of each of the following types of equipment are available for use? (Please indicate the number of pieces--approximate, if necessary)

Softballs ____________
Volleyballs ____________
Basketballs ____________
Utility balls ____________
Bats ____________
Batons ____________
Volleyball nets ____________
Volleyball standards ____________
Phonograph records ____________
Gymnasium mats ____________
Broad jump mats ____________
Protective goggles ____________
Other (specify) ____________

____
____
____
____
____
____

27. (a) Has there been conflict between your program and other programs over the use of facilities? yes ( ) no ( )

(b) If "yes", has the conflict limited your program in any way? yes ( ) no ( )

28. Would you please identify the most important obstacles or problems you have encountered in your attempts to conduct an effective health education program?

____
____
____
____
____
____

(Use reverse side if necessary)

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street
New York

After School Study Center Tutorial Program Work Sheet

Center P.S.____ Address______________________________ Phone #______ Secy.________

Sending Schools	Address	Phone #	Principal

Supervisor	Position	# Sessions/wk.

Session

Classes Area	School Grade	Present P.S.	Register Par. Sc.	Total Register	Ethnic Composition	Name of Teacher

Total Register by area
Total Register by grade
Av. Pupil Teacher Ratio

Name of Teacher	How Selected	Rating X Sect. Staff	Years of Experience	Regular Substitute	Special Abilities

After School Study Center Tutorial Program
Classroom Observation

Center P.S. ____ Area __________ Grade _____ Teacher ________________

Physical Surroundings

Records
- Class list
- Attendance
- Others
- Attendance/register
- Ethnic composition of class

Teaching
- Planning
- Materials and Supplies Used
- Books
- Teacher prepared materials

Lesson Observed
- Type
- Motivation, Interest, Enjoyment, behavior
- Promotion of Integration
- Rating of Lesson

Noteworthy practices

Problems

Suggestions for Improvement

Estimation of success of program
- Teacher's opinion
- Pupil, parent etc. opinion

SUPERVISORY PRACTICES

- LOG OR LESSON PLANS
- SPOT VISITS
- WRITTEN REPORTS
- OTHERS
- RECORDS
- ADMITTING POLICY
- ELIMINATING POLICY
- CLASS PLACEMENT

ARTICULATION WITH NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

- FEEDBACK
- INSPECTION OF RECORDS -WHERE KEPT?
- CLASS LISTS
- ATTENDANCE
- OTHERS

MATERIALS OF INSTRUCTION

- BOOKS
- SUPPLIES
- OTHERS

4- ESTIMATION OF SUCCESS OF PROGRAM

1- NOTEWORTHY PRACTICES

2- PROBLEMS

3- SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street
New York, N.Y. 10036

Title I Evaluations

AFTER-SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS

I. General Information:

1. Name, 1st name first (Optional) Mr. / Mrs. / Miss ______________________________

2. Tutorial Program (circle one) Reading, Arithmetic, Mathematics, English

3. Days you teach (circle proper ones) Tuesday; Wednesday; Thursday;

4. Hours ______________________________

5. School where located (Name) ______________________________

   (Address) ______________________________

6. Non-public schools served:
   1. (Name) ______________________________
      (Address) ______________________________
      (Days served) ______________________________
   2. (Name) ______________________________
      (Address) ______________________________
      (Days served) ______________________________
   3. (Name) ______________________________
      (Address) ______________________________
      (Days served) ______________________________
   4. (Name) ______________________________
      (Address) ______________________________
      (Days served) ______________________________

II. Please tell us about yourself:

7. Sex: ______Male ______Female

8. License ______Regular ______Substitute ______Special

   ______Other

9. Subject area of license: ______________________________

10. Position: ____________ Full-time - ____________ Part-time

11. Years of teaching experience ____________________

12. Level of experience: ________ Elementary; ________ Secondary

________ System-Wide

13. Years of teaching experience in Reading/Mathematics ____________

14. Grade normally taught ______________________________

III. Please tell us about your tutorial class:

15. Number of children registered:

    a. Non-public school children ____________

    b. Public school children ______________

16. What is the average attendance in your class? ________

17. Grades served by your class ____________________

18. Age range in your class ______________________

19. Equipment:

    1. ______ Very adequate

    2. ______ Adequate

    3. ______ Less than adequate

20. What materials, books, and equipment have you not been able to obtain?

21. What materials, books and equipment did you yourself bring, construct, or borrow?

22. Do you believe the content of the program is beneficial to disadvantaged children?

1. ____________Yes
2. ____________No

23. Have you used any diagnostic testing?

1. ____________Yes
2. ____________No

24. If yes, what tests did you use? ____

____

25. Do you believe that the composition of the class is made up chiefly of children who are retarded in reading/arithmetic?

1. ____________Yes
2. ____________No

IV. Please place an X at the proper position on the scales below:

26.

3	2	1
Pupils are highly motivated and enter into the activities enthusiastically.	Pupils are somewhat interested. Some participate, others do not.	Pupils are not Interested and do not participate.

27.

3	2	1
The classroom is attractive. Other facilities are in excellent condition.	The classroom is adequate, but unattractive. Some equipment is damaged.	The classroom is small and poorly equipped. The lessons are hindered by inade-

28. Was the classroom suited to the age range of the children?

    1. ____________Yes

    2. ____________No

29. Did the classroom offer adequate and secure storage space for materials?

    1. ____________Yes

    2. ____________No

V. Do you have any recommendations for next year's program, (administrative equipment, location, etc.)?

VI. Are there any activities of the program which you would like to share with the other teachers in the program?

VII. Comments:

APPENDIX C

Staff List

Dr. Maurice A. Lohman, Evaluation Chairman
Assistant Professor of Education
City University of New York

Dr. Bernard Abramson
Assistant Professor of Education
Mills College

Dr. William Anderson
Associate Professor of Health
and Physical Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

Mr. Joseph Deley
Doctoral Student in Art
Teachers College, Columbia University

Mr. Michael Esselstrom
Assistant Coordinator of Student Teaching
Teachers College, Columbia University

Dr. Paul Fitzgerald
Assistant Professor of Education
St. John's University

Dr. Antoinette Gentile
Assistant Professor of Health and Physical Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

Mr. Stewart Kranz
Assistant Coordinator of Student Teaching
Teachers College, Columbia University

Mr. Edward J. O'Connor
Doctoral Student in Music
Teachers College, Columbia University

Mr. Jack Schlitz
Doctoral Student in Physical Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

Mr. Terrence Larney
Doctoral Student in Physical Education
Teachers College, Columbia University